

SENATE.

MONDAY, January 17, 1921.

Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we thank Thee for the morning light and for all the blessings continued unto us. Enable us to understand Thy requirements, that we may do those things which are just in Thy sight; that we may fulfill every obligation, love mercy, and walk humbly with Thee. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

ROBERT L. OWEN, a Senator from the State of Oklahoma, appeared in his seat to-day.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Thursday, January 13, 1921, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

RENTS ON FEDERAL PROPERTIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of rents received from properties located on sites of proposed public buildings purchased by the Government in the city of Washington, which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

HOSPITAL AT CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury submitting an estimate of appropriation for \$100,000 additional for repairs and remodeling to adapt the hospital at Corpus Christi, Tex., to the needs of the Public Health Service, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the president of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of that company for the year 1920, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had, on January 15, 1921, approved and signed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 244) providing for the payment of expenses of conveying votes of electors for President and Vice President.

The message also announced that Senate bill No. 1, an act authorizing the cutting of timber by corporations organized in one State and conducting operations in another, having been presented to the President on December 30, 1920, and not having been approved by him or returned to the House of Congress in which it originated within the time prescribed by the Constitution of the United States, became a law without his approval.

JOSE A. DE LA TORRIENTE (S. DOC. NO. 353).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying letter from the Acting Secretary of State, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report from the Acting Secretary of State inclosing a draft of a joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to permit Mr. Jose A. de la Torre, a citizen of Cuba, to receive instruction at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis at the expense of the Government of Cuba.

The Acting Secretary of State points out that the passage of the resolution would be regarded as an act of courtesy by the Government of Cuba and that it would follow established precedents.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
17 January, 1921.

WOODROW WILSON.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. WARREN presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from Oliver Hower, president Bighorn County Farm Bureau, of Cowley, Wyo., praying for the enactment of legislation placing a tariff on honey, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. LODGE presented memorials of sundry citizens of the State of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to create a department of education, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a resolution adopted by Council No. 53, of the L'Union St. Jean Baptiste d'Amerique, of Taunton, Mass., opposing the enactment of legislation to create a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Holy Name Society of St. Michael's Parish, of Lowell, Mass., opposing the enactment of legislation to create a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a memorial of sundry members of St. Mark's Church, of Pittsfield, Mass., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to create a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Boston Council of the Friends of Irish Freedom, of Boston, Mass., opposing any action looking to a refund of the British war debt or the waiver of the interest due on that debt, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. NELSON presented a memorial of the Winton Lumber Co., of Minneapolis, Minn., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation placing a tariff on lumber imported from Canada, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented telegrams in the nature of memorials from J. S. Pomeroy, manager Minneapolis Clearing House Association, of Minneapolis, Minn., and O. M. Nelson, president Minnesota Bankers' Association, of Minneapolis, Minn., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to allow national banking associations to establish and operate a separate savings department, which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. HARRIS presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from Edgar G. Ballinger, secretary of the Chemical Congress of American Surgeons, in session at Atlanta, Ga., praying for the enactment of legislation to appropriate \$500,000 for cooperative work with the States for the use of their respective boards or departments of health in the prevention, control, and treatment of venereal diseases, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from J. K. Simmons, president of the Georgia Press Association, of Macon, Ga., transmitting a resolution passed by that association praying for the enactment of legislation to continue distribution of Federal aid to rural post roads in the respective States through the Bureau of Public Roads, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS.

Mr. BECKHAM, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which were referred the following bills, submitted adverse reports thereon, which were agreed to and the bills were postponed indefinitely:

A bill (S. 1198) for the relief of Thomas E. Phillips;

A bill (S. 1250) to correct the military record of Alexander W. Goodreau;

A bill (S. 1532) directing delivery of State war-service records to the States requesting same;

A bill (S. 1199) to correct the military record of Francis M. Benson; and

A bill (S. 1766) for the relief of Abner W. Loomis.

EMERGENCY TARIFF.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance I report back favorably with amendments the bill (H. R. 15275) imposing temporary duties upon certain agricultural products to meet present emergencies, to provide revenue, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 683) thereon. I ask that the report may be printed in the RECORD, as it is very brief.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Report No. 683, to accompany H. R. 15275.]

The Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 15275) imposing temporary duties upon certain agricultural products to meet present emergencies, to provide revenue, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with certain amendments, and as so amended recommend that the bill do pass.

The amendments adopted by the Committee on Finance are as follows:

On page 1, line 10, strike out "30" and insert "40," so that it will read: "1. Wheat, 40 cents per bushel."

On page 2, line 12, after the word "pound," insert "except rice, cleaned for use in the manufacture of canned foods."

Following paragraph 13, insert two new paragraphs as follows:

"14. Fresh or frozen beef, veal, mutton, lamb, and pork, 2 cents per pound. Meats of all kinds, prepared or preserved, not specially provided for herein, 25 per cent ad valorem.

"15. That cattle and sheep and other stock imported for breeding purposes shall be admitted free of duty."

On page 3, line 1, strike out "14" and insert "16"; and strike out "three-eighths" and insert "one-eighth."

On page 3, line 3, strike out "15" and insert "17."

On page 3, line 4, strike out "14" and insert "16."

On page 3, line 7, strike out "16" and insert "18."

On page 3, line 22, strike out "17" and insert "19."

On page 3, line 23, strike out "16" and insert "18."

On page 4, line 1, strike out "16" and insert "18."

Insert, after paragraph 19, the following new paragraphs:

"20. Sugars, tank bottoms, sirups of cane juice, melada, concentrated melada, concrete and concentrated molasses, testing by the polariscope not above 75 degrees, 2.13 cents per pound, and for every additional degree shown by the polariscope test seventy-eight one-thousandths of 1 cent per pound additional, and fractions of a degree in proportion; molasses, testing not above 40 degrees, 45 per cent ad valorem; testing above 40 degrees and not above 56 degrees, 63 cents per gallon; testing above 56 degrees, 13½ cents per gallon. Sugar draining and sugar sweeping shall be subject to duty as molasses or sugar, as the case may be, according to polariscopic test.

"That the duties in this paragraph herein imposed are in addition to the rates of duty imposed on such sugars by existing laws, and shall in no manner affect or impair such existing laws: *Provided*, That if the imposition of the duties herein shall have the effect of increasing the price in the ports of the United States of duty paid 96 degrees centrifugal sugar produced in and imported from Cuba beyond 8 cents per pound, or shall increase the price in the ports of the United States of similar sugars paying full duty beyond 8.76 cents per pound, or shall increase the price in the ports of the United States of sugars that have gone through a process of refining, or sugars fit for direct human consumption, beyond 10 cents per pound, then the emergency duty herein named shall be automatically decreased so as to prevent the prices of such sugars advancing beyond the respective prices herein named.

"21. Butter, and substitutes therefor, 8 cents per pound.

"22. Cheese, and substitutes therefor, 8 cents per pound.

"23. Milk, fresh, 2 cents per gallon; cream, 5 cents per gallon.

"24. Milk, preserved or condensed, or sterilized by heating or other processes, including weight of immediate coverings, 2 cents per pound; sugar of milk, 5 cents per pound.

"25. Wrapper tobacco, and filler tobacco when mixed or packed with more than 15 per cent of wrapper tobacco, and all leaf tobacco the product of two or more countries or dependencies when mixed or packed together, if unstemmed, \$2.85 per pound; if stemmed, \$3.50 per pound; filler tobacco not specially provided for in this section, if unstemmed, 35 cents per pound; if stemmed, 50 cents per pound.

"The term 'wrapper tobacco' as used in this section means that quality of leaf tobacco which has the requisite color, texture, and burn, and is of sufficient size for cigar wrappers, and the term 'filler tobacco' means all other leaf tobacco.

"26. Hides of cattle, raw or uncured, whether dry, salted, or pickled, 15 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That upon all leather exported, made from imported hides, there shall be allowed a drawback equal to the amount of duty paid on such hides, to be paid under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe.

"27. Apples, 20 cents a box: *Provided*, That if at any time the tariff on apples imported into Canada from the United States shall be greater than 30 cents a box, then the tariff on apples imported into this country shall be increased so as to make the tariff on apples imported into the United States the same as the tariff on apples imported into Canada from the United States.

"28. Cherries in a raw state, preserved in brine or otherwise, 4 cents per pound."

On page 4, line 5, strike out "15 and 17" and insert "17, 19, and 20."

Mr. PENROSE. I desire to state to the Senate that I hope at an early date to move to proceed to the consideration of the bill and that it may be made the unfinished business, and I shall make every effort to press it to early passage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

Mr. WARREN. I wish to introduce a bill in the interest of two very deserving ex-service men who, under legislation of last year, drew homesteads in an irrigation district where they were permitted to do so. They were afterwards compelled to relinquish them on account of an error in one of the United States land offices, and to give up the homesteads which had been drawn in the regular way under the law. The bill proposes to give them the privilege of making another filing and of enjoying preference rights in the next opening of farm units under the same irrigation project, as suggested by the Interior Department.

By Mr. WARREN:

A bill (S. 4859) for the relief of certain ex-service men whose rights to make entries on the North Platte irrigation project, Nebraska-Wyoming, were defeated by intervening claims (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. TRAMMELL:

A bill (S. 4860) granting a pension to Narcissa A. Grant; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRONNA:

A bill (S. 4861) to correct the military record of Daniel Wells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 4862) for the relief of Elizabeth Foster Carter (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DILLINGHAM:

A bill (S. 4863) to establish the department of public welfare and to determine its functions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 4864) to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved October 24, 1914; and

A bill (S. 4865) fixing the taxable status of lands received in exchange for lands formerly embraced in the grants to the Oregon & California Railroad Co. and the Coos Bay Wagon Road Co.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PHELAN:

A bill (S. 4866) to authorize the President of the United States to lay embargoes against the exportation of petroleum oil and providing penalties; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 4867) to prohibit improper and corrupt lobbying and to regulate the employment of legislative counsel and agents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS (for Mr. KENYON):

A bill (S. 4868) to define and punish lobbying; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

A bill (S. 4869) granting a pension to Amanda A. M. Taylor; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REED:

A bill (S. 4870) granting a pension to Amelia Perry;

A bill (S. 4871) granting a pension to W. T. Powell (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4872) granting a pension to Mrs. C. A. Thomas (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 4873) for the relief of J. B. Porter (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE (by request):

A bill (S. 4874) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, consider, and adjudicate claims of the Chippewa Indians of Lake Superior against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

AMENDMENTS TO SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. POINDEXTER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$496,000, for the purchase of a site and for working drawings for an archives building in the District of Columbia, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Mr. GAY submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$50,000 for the construction of a mailing platform at the New Orleans (La.) post office, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

STANDING COMMITTEES.

On motion of Mr. LODGE, it was

Ordered, That the standing committees of the Senate as constituted at the end of this session be, and they are hereby, continued until the next session of Congress or until their successors are duly elected.

STATEMENT OF MARSHAL FOCH (S. DOC. NO. 354).

Mr. LODGE. I ask to have printed as a Senate document the statement of Marshal Foch in regard to the armistice and the treaty of Versailles. It is a statement which he made on the 8th of November, 1920. It is not long, and it is very interesting. It has been only partially printed.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed as a Senate document.

AMENDMENT OF PENAL LAWS.

On motion of Mr. NELSON, it was

Ordered, That the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 12161) to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," approved March 4, 1909 (35 Stat. L., p. 1134), and that it be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

PETROLEUM OIL IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

Mr. PHELAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 423), which was read:

Whereas, pursuant to the request of the Senate, the President of the United States on May 17, 1920, reported certain laws and regulations discriminating against citizens of the United States in foreign countries in the matter of the exploration and mining for petroleum oil: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the United States, That the Secretary of State, if not inconsistent with the public interest, be, and he is hereby, requested to inform this body to what extent such discriminations have been practiced, where and by whom, and what steps, if any, have been taken to protect American rights.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over under the rule.

APPOINTMENT OF EX-SERVICE MEN AS POSTMASTERS.

Mr. FLETCHER. I submit a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 424) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads be directed to ascertain from the Postmaster General the names of all former service men, and the widows of such, recommended to the President for appointment as postmaster and by the President submitted to the Senate for confirmation and not acted upon; and that the committee be further directed to consider and report promptly to the Senate all such nominations submitted, so that appropriate action may be taken.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over under the rule.

Mr. FLETCHER. The object of the resolution is, of course, apparent. Under the present rule ex-service men and widows of ex-service men have a preference in appointment, and a number of these nominations include such appointments. I wish to ascertain how many there are. I can not think that our friends on the other side will object to their confirmation.

Mr. TOWNSEND. My attention was diverted during the reading of the resolution. I did not hear it all, but I understood the gist of it to be that the Senator is asking that the nominations be confirmed.

Mr. FLETCHER. That the committee report on the number of ex-service men and widows of ex-service men who have been nominated, with a view to their confirmation.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I think it is generally known that we have had no executive session during this session of Congress, and there is nothing before the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads in the way of nominations. I ask that the resolution may go over, in order that I may have an opportunity to understand just what it is, as I did not hear it all when it was read.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am perfectly willing to have it reread.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I think it had better go over for one day, until I can see what it is. I am stating a fact when I say, as the Senator knows, that we have had no executive session. Only through executive session can nominations go to the committee. We have none pending before the committee now.

Mr. FLETCHER. I understand that. I wanted to secure the information with a view to an executive session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over under the rule.

GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL.

The VICE PRESIDENT (at 12 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.). Morning business is closed. The calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, in connection with the calendar, I have been instructed by the Committee on Military Affairs to bring a certain measure to the attention of the Senate. I am informed that the reading of the calendar would commence somewhere in the neighborhood of Calendar No. 500, but on page 5 of the calendar, under General Orders, there is a bill (S. 3224) relating to the creation in the Army of the United States of the grade of lieutenant general, which I beg leave to call to the attention of the Senate at the request of the Committee on Military Affairs. I ask for its consideration at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. HARRISON. The object of the Senator is to take up the bill out of order?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes; and I wish to take advantage of the opportunity to explain why the committee directed me to make the request.

Mr. HARRISON. After the bill is out of the way, we shall then proceed with the calendar in regular order?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask that the bill may be read. I do not know that I have any objection to its present consideration, but I think it is better to have the bill read before unanimous consent is granted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read.

The Assistant Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the Army of the United States the grade of lieutenant general is hereby revived, and the President is hereby authorized, in his discretion and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint to said grade one general officer, who, within the United States, prior to the close of the recent war, rendered especially distinguished service, and two general officers, who, prior to the close of hostilities, especially distinguished themselves in command of field armies in the American Expeditionary Forces; and the officers appointed under the foregoing authorization shall have the pay prescribed by section 24 of the act of Congress approved July 15, 1870, and such

allowances as the President shall deem appropriate: *Provided*, That no more than three appointments to office shall be made under the terms of this act.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, this bill was reported by the Committee on Military Affairs October 18, 1919—more than a year ago—and it has been on the calendar ever since. As the bill has been reached from time to time on the calendar, objection to its consideration has been entered, and thus far the Senate has not considered it. The bill, as may be seen, proposes to revive the grade of lieutenant general in the Army and to authorize the President to appoint three officers to that grade, two officers who have especially distinguished themselves in command of field armies in France prior to the close of hostilities and one officer who especially distinguished himself in the United States.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from New York what generals the committee had in mind when the bill was reported?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I was just about to state that. While the bill does not mention the names of general officers who are under contemplation in this connection, its very terms confine the recognition to be extended to officers of the American Expeditionary Forces to two generals, Gen. Liggett and Gen. Bullard, for they were the only officers who commanded field armies in France prior to the close of the hostilities. Gen. Liggett commanded the First Army, and Gen. Bullard commanded the Second. Gen. Liggett must be retired on account of age on March 21 next. Gen. Bullard has three more years to serve upon the active list before retirement. The committee very sincerely believes that the bill should pass, but is especially concerned over the status of Gen. Liggett. If Congress does not take any action with respect to him at this session he will be retired in the grade of major general, which he now occupies, and which grade he occupied before the United States went into the war. It is accurate to say that Gen. Liggett is the only general officer of the Army who after hostilities have ceased, after the war is over, finds himself in the same grade which he occupied before the war started. As I have said, if the Congress does not act during this session to give him some recognition for his extraordinary services, he will be retired in the same grade which he occupied when he first went to France.

Now, let me say just a word as to his services. Gen. Liggett went to France at the very beginning of our participation in the war. He went there with the grade of major general in the Regular Army in command of a division. After services covering some little time in that capacity he was promoted to the emergency rank of lieutenant general. He served in command of a corps and commanded the American corps which took part in the crushing in of the Marne salient, July, 1918, and rendered most excellent and conspicuous service upon that occasion, being the first American officer to command troops in the field in any large numbers.

He also continued in command of the corps during the St. Mihiel offensive. At the outset of the Meuse-Argonne offensive Gen. Liggett was promoted to the command of the First American Field Army and had under his command, at one time or another, approximately 1,000,000 men. He commanded the First American Field Army until the close of the hostilities, and, next to Gen. Pershing himself, he carried the greatest responsibility of any officer of the American Expeditionary Forces in the management of combat troops in the field in the face of the enemy.

The committee has believed all along that this officer is thoroughly entitled to some recognition for his extraordinary services during those trying days. Every other officer who held considerable command in France has come out of the war holding a higher grade in the regular service than the grade which he held when he went into the war. Gen. Liggett alone is the officer of the entire Army who has had no recognition whatsoever, and yet his part, next to that of Gen. Pershing, was the most conspicuous played by any officer of the American Army during the war. It is for that especial reason that the committee has instructed me to bring this matter before the Senate and to ascertain if the Senate can not act upon the passage of the bill, which would make it possible for Gen. Liggett to have this recognition.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I feel very strongly that the list of promotions and appointments to the position of major general and brigadier general ought to be thoroughly examined. I do not desire at this time to indulge in any criticism as to the manner in which rewards and punishments have been distributed under the present administration, and by that I include the staffs. I think the matter will require very careful consid-

eration of the Senate of the United States before we accede to such promotions and appointments.

The bill for which consideration is requested provides for three lieutenant generals. I hope it will not be passed in that form. I realize that Gen. Liggett's case is an exceptional one, and I should like to see something done for him, but I do not wish to go further than that. If it is proposed to provide for the appointment of three lieutenant generals now, without an opportunity to examine the matter, I shall very reluctantly be compelled to object.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, in view of that situation I shall follow out the directions of the Committee on Military Affairs and propose an amendment to the bill.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, before the Senator proposes the amendment I should like to ask a question. The Senator has just stated what the facts are which justified the committee in asking for the advancement for Gen. Liggett, and, as I am informed, I am in entire sympathy with what the chairman of the committee has said in his behalf; but I should like to know who the other two generals are who were in the mind of the committee?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have stated that Gen. Bullard, who commanded the Second Army in the Meuse-Argonne offensive, would be the only other eligible officer under the first provision of the bill.

The bill does not mention any of these officers by name; but in the case of the officer who is authorized to be appointed for having performed especially distinguished services in the United States the Committee on Military Affairs had in mind the recognition of Gen. March, the Chief of Staff, during the war. It was understood by the committee when the bill was reported that Gens. Liggett, Bullard, and March would be the beneficiaries of the measure.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, did I understand the Senator from New York to say that every officer who commanded troops overseas during the war had come out with a higher grade than that held by him when he went into the war?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Every one.

Mr. OVERMAN. I think the Senator is mistaken. I know an officer who commanded troops in engagements before the Hindenburg line who has not been promoted. I think he deserves promotion. He is now a colonel, although he served as a general during that fight. I repeat he has not been rewarded, and I do not know why.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Was he a colonel at the time he went into the war?

Mr. OVERMAN. He was a colonel at the time he went into the war. As I stated, he commanded the troops which fought at the Hindenburg line and succeeded in breaking that line. He occupied for a time the grade of brigadier general, but has been put back to the old rank occupied by him when he went into the war.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is the only such case of which I have ever heard. The Secretary of War and Gen. Pershing, who appeared before the Committee on Military Affairs several days ago in behalf of this proposal, made the statement that Gen. Liggett was the only officer who had held general rank in France who had received no promotion as the result of his service.

Now, Mr. President, in view of the objection announced by the Senator from Massachusetts—

Mr. OVERMAN. Let me say right there that I went before the Secretary of War and asked that the officer to whom I have referred be promoted. I think my appearance there was resented and probably the department has disciplined the officer and not advanced him in rank because of the fact that my colleague and I went to the War Department and asked for his promotion: So he stands now where he did when he went into the war. Although he fought that great fight he has not been recognized at all.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, in view of the objection announced by the Senator from Massachusetts, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk. I do so at the direction of the Committee on Military Affairs, and in doing so I desire to say that I still believe that the other officers to whom I have referred should receive this recognition; but the case of Gen. Liggett is an emergency matter, for unless this Congress acts nothing can ever be done for him of a suitable character.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if I may ask the Senator a question, was this action taken by the committee on Friday last?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It was.

Mr. McKELLAR. I was not present at the meeting of the committee on Friday, having been necessarily detained in one of the departments and not being able to get there. As I under-

stand, the amendment provides for striking out the names of Gen. March and Gen. Bullard.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The names of the officers do not appear in the bill at all.

Mr. McKELLAR. But that is the effect of the proposed amendment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The effect will be readily apparent when the Secretary reads the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I believe that the same treatment should be accorded all three of the officers who have been mentioned, and I shall object to the consideration of the bill to-day unless we take it up as reported out by the committee originally providing for all three.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I hope the Senator from Tennessee will not press that objection. May I say to the Senator that in the case of the other two officers Gen. Bullard has three years to serve before retiring, and the next Congress, if it saw fit, could pass legislation giving him the recognition which I believe he deserves; Gen. March has four or five years yet to serve before retiring, and the next Congress or the succeeding Congress, if it saw fit, could give him the recognition which I believe he also deserves; but it must be this Congress that shall act upon the case of Gen. Liggett, and as the Senator from Tennessee knows, every day is precious. The committee had a very full attendance; we heard Gen. Pershing, who made a personal plea for his great lieutenant who helped him so ably to fight the great battles in the last six weeks of the World War, and by a unanimous vote the chairman of the committee was requested to lay this matter before the Senate in just the way I have done it. I think we might well take this opportunity to show that republics are not always ungrateful.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from Tennessee that the committee has not reversed its action with regard to the favorable report of this bill as it was originally presented, and there is no purpose now to abandon the idea of taking proper care of Gen. March and Gen. Bullard; but the emergency is that Gen. Liggett retires in March, and unless this action is taken now it will never do him any good. He ought to be taken care of.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree with what the Senator says about Gen. Liggett; but it is equally clear that unless the three come in together Gen. Bullard and Gen. March will be left out, and I think all three are entitled to this recognition.

Mr. FLETCHER. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will withdraw the matter for a week, and let us discuss it in the committee and see if we can not make some arrangement that will bring about the desired result.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will my friend the Senator from New York yield for a question?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON. Has the committee taken any action regarding the large number of promotions in the Army that were sent to the Senate at the beginning of this session—something like 4,000, I believe?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I will say to the Senator from Arkansas that the committee has not, because those nominations are not yet pending before the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. ROBINSON. No executive session has been held since that time?

Mr. WADSWORTH. None.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Suppose we should pass the bill, and suppose the House should pass the bill, and the President sent in the nomination of Gen. Liggett, we would still be in the same position that we are now, because there has been no reference of any of these nominations, and unless we have some assurance that the appointment will be confirmed I think we are going through a useless proceeding. That is why I suggested a delay of a week to talk it over.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me further for a brief statement?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. My information is that several thousand military nominations were sent to the Senate at the beginning of this session, and that no action has as yet been taken looking toward a consideration of those nominations by the Senate or any committee of the Senate. In that list of nominations so sent to the Senate a long while ago, and which the Senator from New York has not even asked to have referred to his committee, there are a large number of officers who are just as much entitled to the gratitude of this Republic, just as much entitled to the fair and prompt consideration and action of the Senate, as is any officer whose promotion is contemplated by the

bill now submitted out of order by the Senator from New York.

In that list of several thousand officers are hundreds of men as brave as ever wore the uniform of the United States Army, as gallant as any men who ever went down to battle or ever breasted the flood of death; and I want to ask the Senator from New York now whether it is proposed that these nominations shall be defeated or rejected by the failure on the part of the Senate to act?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator let me call his attention to the fact that there are probably about 4,000 of these officers whose opportunity for appointment will expire on March 4?

Mr. ROBINSON. And they will go out of the service of the United States—out of the Army.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Just let me finish—so that there are 4,000 who will lose their position entirely unless we act upon their nominations.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ROBINSON. And not only is that true, but the United States will lose their service. So, Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maryland is making a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FRANCE. I desire to inquire if the question before the Senate is the request for unanimous consent for the consideration of this measure?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the question.

Mr. ROBINSON. I object, Mr. President, to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. FRANCE. I object, and call for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That ends it.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, I understood that the Senator from New York had secured unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill, and that a motion had been made to amend it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. He had not.

Mr. PHELAN. Then I am in error.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is in error.

CHIEF GUNNER ROBERT EDWARD COX, UNITED STATES NAVY.

Mr. PAGE. From the Committee on Naval Affairs I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 12469) to authorize the award of a medal of honor to Chief Gunner Robert Edward Cox, United States Navy, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. SMOOT. Let it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read.

The Assistant Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to award a medal of honor to Chief Gunner Robert Edward Cox, United States Navy, in recognition of the extraordinary heroism he displayed on the occasion of the accident which occurred in the after turret of the United States ship *Missouri* on April 13, 1904.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HOSPITALS FOR SICK AND DISABLED SOLDIERS.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I made objection to the consideration of the measure for the promotion of lieutenants general because I felt that it would be improper for the Senate to take up the consideration of the promotion of generals until it should have made provision, by passing the hospital bill, for our sick and disabled soldiers, who by the thousands are suffering to-day because adequate hospital facilities have not been supplied. I desire to give notice that to-morrow, at the close of the morning business, I shall call up the bill providing hospital facilities for the sick and disabled soldiers.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator from Maryland that the Public Health Service desires at this time that the building program for hospitals shall be taken care of in the sundry civil bill; and I will say to the Senator, from what I know of the feeling of the Appropriations Committee that the first appropriation toward that program will be made as requested, not only by the Secretary of the Treasury but by the Surgeon General of the Army. In other words, the testimony before the committee shows that \$30,000,000 will be required for the building of hospitals. The plan has been mapped out. The plans for the buildings have been agreed upon. Perhaps in some cases the locations have not been selected; but the appropriation asked for this year is \$10,000,000, and if the Appropriations Committee provides the

\$10,000,000 for beginning that plan there will be no need whatever for passing the bill to which the Senator has reference.

Mr. FRANCE. When may it be hoped that the committee will act upon the matter?

Mr. SMOOT. Just as soon as we can dispose of the appropriation bill, and it will be reported to the Senate some time this week. I will say to the Senator that if the item is carried in the appropriation bill it will become a law long before the bill to which he has reference could pass the Senate and then pass the House.

Mr. FRANCE. I am not concerned about the method by which the appropriation is secured, but I am very much concerned about the delay. This bill was reported on the 2d day of last June, and it was then considered to be an emergency measure. We could secure no action on the 2d of last June. We have been unable to secure action since.

Mr. SMOOT. It is an emergency matter, and the Secretary of the Treasury and also the Surgeon General of the Army have stated that it will take three years to build the different hospitals; and they ask for \$30,000,000, and request that in this appropriation bill \$10,000,000 be provided for the first year, and I will say to the Senator that I have no doubt it will be done.

Mr. FRANCE. I am very much encouraged to hear it.

REDUCTION OF THE ARMY.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, I desire at this time to call up the matter of the reconsideration of the vote on the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 236) directing the Secretary of War to cease enlisting men in the Regular Army of the United States until the number of enlisted men shall not exceed 150,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the author of the amendment, the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROO], is not here, and I hope the Senator from California will not ask for a vote on the matter in his absence. It is his amendment that we propose to reconsider. I understand that the Senator from Wisconsin will be back on Thursday, and the matter can be voted upon then. I have just looked at the rules to see what the parliamentary situation is. I do not know whether I have the right to ask that the matter go over or not. If I have, I should like to make that request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will tell the Senator in a minute.

Mr. McKELLAR. It seems to me that the motion should go over until the junior Senator from Wisconsin, the author of the amendment, returns. He will be here on Thursday.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I call the attention of the Senator from Tennessee to the fact that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROO] was not here at the time the vote was originally taken, and I understood at the time that he was paired. Doubtless his pair will protect him in connection with any vote that is now taken. Let me remind the Senator that we were told by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. NEW] that recruits are being enlisted at the rate, my recollection is, of 2,000 a day. He pointed out the additional cost for each day's delay in the disposition of the joint resolution. I remind the Senator that the motion to reconsider suspends the action of the Senate and the present status is continued, so that these enlistments are going on every day that the matter remains in abeyance. Under these circumstances I rather think the Senator from Wisconsin would not like to ask that the matter be further delayed on account of his absence, imperative though it may be.

I trust that the Senator will withdraw his objection and allow us to take a vote on the motion to reconsider.

Mr. McKELLAR. It was a mere suggestion on my part. I then move, Mr. President, that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table, and on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. ASHURST. Let us have the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HENDERSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK]. In his absence I transfer my pair to the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] and vote "nay."

Mr. KNOX (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN]. I am advised that if he were present he would vote as I shall vote. I therefore feel at liberty to cast my vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. POMERENE (when his name was called). I have a temporary general pair with the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS]. I do not know how he would vote on this question, and I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. STERLING (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH].

I transfer my pair to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have a general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL]. I am informed that he would vote the same way I shall vote on this question, and therefore I vote "nay."

Mr. MYERS. Has the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. MYERS. I have a pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN], which I transfer to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] and vote "nay."

Mr. GLASS. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN], and in his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. HENDERSON (after having voted in the negative). I observe that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] has entered the Chamber. Therefore I will have to withdraw my pair announced a few minutes ago and withhold my vote.

Mr. McCUMBER. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL] and vote "nay."

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS];

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT]; and

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN].

Mr. GERRY. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] on account of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—26.

Borah	Gronna	McNary	Swanson
Capper	Harrison	Norris	Trammell
Culberson	Heflin	Overman	Walsh, Mass.
Dial	Johnson, S. Dak.	Reed	Walsh, Mont.
France	Jones, Wash.	Sheppard	Williams
Gerry	Kenyon	Simmons	
Gore	McKellar	Smith, Md.	

NAYS—45.

Ashurst	Hale	Nelson	Smoot
Beckham	Harris	New	Spencer
Brandeggee	Hitchcock	Page	Sterling
Calder	Kellogg	Penrose	Sutherland
Coit	Keyes	Phelan	Townsend
Curtis	King	Phipps	Underwood
Dillingham	Kirby	Pittman	Wadsworth
Fernald	Knox	Poindexter	Warren
Fletcher	Lodge	Ransdell	Willis
Frelinghuysen	McCumber	Robinson	
Gay	Moses	Smith, Ariz.	
Gooding	Myers	Smith, Ga.	

NOT VOTING—25.

Ball	Henderson	McLean	Stanley
Chamberlain	Johnson, Calif.	Newberry	Thomas
Cummins	Jones, N. Mex.	Owen	Watson
Edge	Kendrick	Pomerene	Wolcott
Elkins	La Follette	Sherman	
Fall	Lenroot	Shields	
Glass	McCormick	Smith, S. C.	

So the Senate refused to lay the motion to reconsider on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is, Shall the vote whereby the joint resolution was passed be reconsidered?

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is, Shall the vote whereby the joint resolution was ordered to a third reading be reconsidered?

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution is now in the Senate and open to amendment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I move that the joint resolution be amended by striking out the phrase "150,000" wherever it occurs, and in lieu thereof inserting the phrase "175,000."

Mr. ROBINSON. I suggest to the Senator from New York that the Senate had better reconsider the vote by which the amendments were concurred in.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Has not that vote been reconsidered?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; it has not. The Chair is of the opinion that the parliamentary question is, Shall the vote whereby the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole were concurred in by the Senate be reconsidered?

Mr. ROBINSON. That was the suggestion I rose to make.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the vote whereby the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole were concurred in be reconsidered?

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Now the question is on concurring in the amendments as in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. WADSWORTH. There will have to be a change in at least one of the amendments. The percentage to which the different branches of the service may be recruited should be changed to 62½ from 53½.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the amendments are nonconcurring in, that amendment can be subsequently offered.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. I have been kept from the Senate by indisposition, and I am not familiar with the status of this particular measure. Will the Chair enlighten me on the status of the joint resolution, so far as it affects the question of the size of the Army?

The VICE PRESIDENT. In Committee of the Whole the Senate practically instructed the Secretary of War to cease further enlistments and to discharge soldiers at present in the Army until the Army has been reduced to 150,000. The original joint resolution called for 175,000. I do not think the Chair is authorized to state the arguments on the question.

Mr. REED. I do not care for the arguments; but now the situation is that we are about to vote to go back to 175,000?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is it substantially, whether the Senate will concur in the amendments or not.

Mr. BORAH. We are about to vote on the question as to whether we will go back to 175,000.

Mr. REED. That is the statement just made by the Vice President.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Does not the question now recur on concurring in the amendments which reduced the Army to 150,000, and those who desire to see the Army reduced to only 175,000 will vote against concurring in the pending amendments?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the opinion of the Chair.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am not in any physical condition to express myself on this matter as I would like to do, and I do not expect that what I am about to say, which will be very brief, will change the result of the vote; but I want to say it for the sake of the Record.

When the bill proposing to fasten a standing Army upon the country of 300,000 was before the Senate a few months ago, I opposed its passage, and I think I made two motions looking toward a reduction. In one of them, as I recall, I placed the number at 200,000, not because I believed we needed 200,000 men, but because I hoped that we might succeed in making a reduction which might be impossible if the figure were made lower.

At that time I challenged the sponsors of the bill to state any good reason why we needed an Army of 300,000 men in a time of profound peace, and I received no reply to that challenge.

The bill was put over at 300,000 on the mere naked assertion that we needed that many men and proposed to have them. I am delighted to find that the same Senators and the same committee within this very short period of a few months have revised their views and are willing to reduce the Army to 175,000. It seems that in the progress of time some of the old, sound ideas of our Government are beginning gradually to filter their way into the official conscience of the country. But in my humble judgment we have not progressed as far in that direction as we should.

I still demand to know why we need 150,000 troops in a time of profound peace in the United States of America. We got along with an Army of 75,000 to 80,000 during all of the years preceding the war. I think 105,000 was the maximum that we had even when we were threatened with serious disturbance along our southern boundary—89,000 the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] corrects me, and I thank him.

Mr. FLETCHER. One hundred and five thousand is the correct number.

Mr. REED. I am speaking without notes and merely from recollection. Everybody knows that the Army had then temporarily been increased, because of the serious nature of our affairs in Mexico. So far as we can now observe a better state of affairs exists in Mexico than has existed there for a considerable number of years. It appears, and I trust appearances are not deceptive, that they have established something bearing a very close relation to a stable government in Mexico. Whether they have or whether they have not, if any difference should arise in the future, we know that we have now in the United States two and one-half million trained men, and that we could, if unhappily called upon to do so, raise and equip an army for all troubles that might arise south of the Rio Grande River.

I inquire, then, whether there is any danger from abroad that calls for the maintenance of an Army of 175,000 men? What nation is about to attack us? From what direction does the menace come?

Certainly not from Germany, for that country, lies there prostrate and disarmed and we are being told every day that her people are starving, and American citizens are being called upon to contribute their money to feed the children of Germany,

Is there any danger from Austria? That country has been dismembered, and out of its component parts have been constructed three or four other countries, our own children, with whom we are not only at amity but to whom we have been loaning money, in my opinion contrary to law, since the war ended. They not only have no disposition to attack us, they not only have no ability to attack us, but they are not able to stand apparently without the financial prop of the United States to sustain them. Austria, it is said, has practically applied for a receivership. There is left a population of 8,000,000 people with a city of two and one-half million people, and I think all economists agree an impossible condition has been created and that the Austrian Kingdom must be in some way reconstructed in order that it may continue to exist as a government and as a nation.

Are we fearful of France? I not only say that we are in no danger from France, if France were ill-disposed, but in my judgment we have in France a friend who not only would not move to our attack but would probably come to our defense in case of any struggle.

Are we fearful of Great Britain, a country whose soldiers stood by our soldiers only a few months ago, to whom we have loaned, I believe, over five thousand million dollars, the interest upon which is not being paid, and an extension, while not legally granted or officially asked, is nevertheless, in fact, granted? And the indulgence of this Government is an additional evidence of our friendly interest in Great Britain. We surely are in no danger of attack from Great Britain at this time.

There remains but one country powerful enough to in any way injure us. I have not spoken of Italy. Any attack by Italy is unthinkable. The country to which I refer is, of course, Japan. So far as I am concerned I am inclined to regard with very great discredit the rumors that Japan is working herself into a war fervor against the United States. Economically, it is impossible for her to wage any considerable war with the United States. She could only do so if she had the aid of Great Britain, and if there is any real danger of Japan and Great Britain combining against the United States, then we need not an army of 175,000, but we need military training in the United States and a preparation such as the country has never yet dreamed of, and the bill does not answer such a purpose.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I would prefer to yield in a moment when I get to a stopping point.

Mr. MYERS. Does the Senator get to a stopping point often?

Mr. REED. I was hoping to. That is the reason I did not yield to the Senator. But I will yield to him now.

Mr. MYERS. I will withdraw that humorous question, Mr. President, because I know the Senator, like all other speakers, does stop quite as often as he starts to speak, and he always talks most interestingly.

Mr. REED. I will yield to the Senator now.

Mr. MYERS. I thank the Senator for his courtesy. The Senator asked a few minutes ago for some reason why the Army of the country should be maintained at 175,000 enlisted men. I will give him what I think is one sufficient reason.

Gen. Pershing appeared before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs last Friday and stated, while he thought it would be very unwise to reduce the number of enlisted men below 200,000, that if the number should be reduced to anything below 175,000 it would practically destroy the framework of a skeletonized Army which was contemplated and provided for by the Army reorganization bill, which is a plan for the maintenance of an Army of certain size and dimensions that was favored by Congress last year. He stated that while he thought the number should not go below 200,000, it might be reduced to 175,000 without destroying the plan, but to reduce it below 175,000 would so disrupt and impair the framework and foundation of the Army that if we should be called upon in any emergency in future to enlarge the Army to a much larger number in a comparatively short time, we would be unable quickly and effectively to do so, because the framework for the enlargement of the Army would not be there, intact and unimpaired, to the required extent. We would not, in that event, have the regiments in sufficient number to enable us to recruit a large Army and expand the regiments into divisions within a reasonably short time, and it would simply be equivalent to undermining the foundation of a house, Gen. Pershing contends, to reduce the number of enlisted men below 175,000.

The Secretary of War was there with Gen. Pershing, and was equally emphatic in the same contention. I do not believe that anyone has ever accused the Secretary of War of being a militarist.

Mr. REED. No; nor of being military.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Nor of being a military expert.

Mr. REED. No; nor of being a military expert.

Mr. MYERS. I believe it is acknowledged by a good many people that he is a good executive officer and did good executive work during our war with Germany.

Mr. REED. I expect there are some people who acknowledge it.

Mr. MYERS. I am one of them, I am glad to say.

Mr. REED. I am not, I am equally glad to say; so we will let it go at that. I am going to take this statement up in a moment and answer it. I thought it would probably be aside from the line of thought I was on, and that is why I asked the Senator to defer it for a few moments. I want to conclude the thought I was on.

I ask, are we in danger of attack by Japan? Economically Japan could not maintain the contest without aid from the outside. She could not land a single soldier in the United States. I say that for this reason: Her battle fleet is not the equal of the battle fleet of the United States, and until the battle fleet of the United States is sunk, no transport laden with soldiers can cross the Pacific Ocean and land upon the American coast.

The only reason we were able to transport soldiers from the United States during the war with Germany was because the British fleet had swept every German ship from the ocean except the submarine, and the British fleet, plus the American, French, Italian, and Japanese fleets, was able to smother the submarine and to defend our transports against it. If there had been upon the ocean a half dozen German men-of-war, capable of keeping the seas, we should have had the gravest difficulty in landing any of our troops, and probably many of our transports would have gone to the bottom. Until Japan can sink the last of the American vessels or drive them under the guns of our fortresses or compel them to intern she can not transport an army across the Pacific Ocean, and if she landed here with anything less than 3,000,000 men she would have simply landed a cemetery, where the last one of them would sleep forever.

In order to land such an army and to maintain it necessarily implies a complete mastery of the ocean, fleets of fast transports to carry goods and armament and reinforcements. Upon the other hand, we have the superior fleet, judging by every rule of naval warfare, and, following one or two sharp conflicts, Japan ought to be completely overcome upon the ocean and every vessel she has sent to the bottom. If we are not in that position, it is our business to get in that position at once; not wait for foreign ships to land upon our soil, but be prepared to stop them in midocean. So the proposed Army can not be justified upon the theory that it is necessary to protect us against raids of Japanese soldiers.

What, then, do we need with such an Army? Now, I come to the only answer that I have heard given: That a scheme of a grand army of a certain size, with certain units, has been laid out; that in order to produce such an army in skeleton form it is necessary to have 175,000 men, so that the skeleton may be of such dimensions as to have built about it the complete scheme of the grand army; and that, therefore, that scheme for an army of a certain size having been adopted we must have a skeleton army of a certain size. Where does that leave us? It simply leaves us in the position that all we have got to do is to go back and change the original scheme a little and make the original scheme fit an army of 150,000 men, where it now fits an army of 175,000.

Mr. MYERS. I think the Senator from Missouri is right about that. If we reduce the skeleton below 175,000 enlisted men, which Gen. Pershing said would necessarily be required, we must go back to the Army reorganization bill and reconstruct the whole plan.

Mr. REED. Exactly; and that would be a terrible thing to do. It would take the Army experts probably about a week's time to revamp the whole plan; probably they could do it in three hours. The premise of this whole argument is that we have fixed a certain scheme for a grand army in case of war—

Mr. MYERS. It would require action by Congress to change it.

Mr. REED. And that now we must not change that, but must adapt everything to it, although the scheme was adopted at a time when Congress was under the impression that we had to have an army in time of peace of 300,000 men.

Mr. MYERS. If the Senator will permit me, such a change would require action by Congress as well as by the General Staff of the Army.

Mr. REED. Certainly, and Congress can take that action just as easily as it can pass this joint resolution. That is the trouble with this whole line of argument. It is based upon the fallacy that Congress did something, adopted a certain plan, that is immutable; that every other plan that is hereafter adopted must fit into that plan; when really all we have got to do is to go back and modify the original plan a little bit and shape it to what we think is the condition of affairs to-day.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the Senator from Missouri pardon an interruption?

Mr. REED. I will.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] is dwelling, and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS] has dwelt, upon the size of the skeleton in order to suit the size of the flesh and blood. No one has yet told us how the size of the skeleton was reached, because no one has told what the size of the entire body of flesh and blood is going to be. The Senator from Montana has not told us; Gen. Pershing has not told us; nor has anyone else. If the skeleton is required solely for the purpose of fitting the flesh and blood, and no one has told us what the thing with the flesh and the blood on it is going to be, how can anybody justify the requirements of the skeleton?

Mr. REED. I thank the Senator. Of course, the argument he makes is unanswerable unless these gentlemen can come forward and show that the plan that has been adopted for the full-sized Army is one that it is absolutely necessary to have and that any change in it would be detrimental to the Republic. They have not given us that information, as I am informed.

Now, let us see about the opinions of military experts. I would not pluck one wreath from the laurels that adorn the brow of Gen. Pershing; I have heard him criticized; I have heard people say he was a martinet; I have heard a lot of such things; but I have never seen anything yet that led me to any other conclusion than that he was a great soldier. This great soldier, however, is confronted by a bill passed by Congress, which he probably O. K'd—I do not know as to that—embodying a scheme for an immense army in time of war. I do not know the Regular Army officer, the professional soldier—and I say it with all the respect in the world—who has not always been clamoring for a greater standing army; I do not know the naval officer who has not also been clamoring for a great navy.

It is just as natural as life itself to these men engaged in these professions to want to make their respective branches of the defense of this country impregnable; it is just as natural as it is for a man to want always to find his arms strong enough to beat down any adversary. That is natural; I have no criticism of them; but it is the business of Congress to stand between such demands and the burdens which must be placed upon our people; to strike a just medium and to determine what the policy of the country shall be. We have always had to do that. If the Regular Army could have written the military bills of the past we would have had an Army of half a million men in this country many years ago. If the Navy could have written the naval bills of the past, we would have had a war fleet that would have been capable of driving the combined fleets of the nations of the world into their ports and under the guns of their fortresses. But Congress and the American people have not taken that view, and they have been wise in not taking it.

Military men make mistakes. The same gentlemen who are here now saying we can not get along with less than 175,000 men a few weeks ago were here saying we had to have 300,000

men. It was their testimony that was read to me to silence me, or to attempt to silence me, a few weeks ago when I insisted that the Army should not be 300,000 men. Now, a change has come over the spirit of our dreams. I do not know what has caused it, but, thank God, it has come.

Do you quote Mr. Baker to me? Mr. Baker was for 300,000 men. Perhaps somebody will quote Mr. Daniels to me. One day he is in favor of total disarmament, as silly a proposal as ever fell from human lips, for if you totally disarm the white race, the civilized nations of the world, they would be overwhelmed the next day by the barbarous hordes. Reduction of armament is a different question, and one for which I have a very hearty sympathy; but disarmament is not a thinkable thing. So one day Mr. Daniels is in favor of disarmament; the next day he thinks it would be the most glorious thing in the world if all the German war fleet were taken into the middle of the ocean and sunk; the next day he demands that we build a grand new fleet greater than that of Great Britain, having in the meantime sunk the exact duplicates of the ships we are to produce; and the next day after that, without batting an eye, we see the German war fleet turned over to Great Britain to increase by 33 per cent the already overmastering force of that nation upon the high seas. So, when you quote authority to me, I reserve the right to do my own thinking about it.

Mr. President, I have just this to say in conclusion:

This country stands face to face with some tremendous problems. We are just beginning to emerge from the fever of this war, and there will result, there is resulting, the natural reaction which comes at the end of any fever; the weakness, sometimes almost the paralysis for a time, of the body that has been consumed by the fires of enthusiasm, or of fever, or of whatever term you may choose to employ. We must rebuild our own industries. We must rehabilitate our own country. The task is a gigantic one, and as we approach it we find ourselves compelled to pay every day the interest upon twenty-eight thousand millions of dollars of war debt, with ten billions of that money loaned in Europe, and probably a large amount of it never will be returned; but in the meantime we must pay the interest, and we must wait the day when that money may or may not be returned. For the present it is our burden, and we must bear it. That heavy weight upon our taxpayers and upon our industries is a serious handicap upon the prosperity of the Republic, and may produce disastrous consequences if we are not wise.

In addition to this, as an incident to the war, there will be fastened upon Government extraordinary expenses which prior to the war we were not called upon to meet; so that altogether there now rests upon the people of the United States a burden of taxation such as our fathers never dreamed of, and such as we never dreamed of until the trouble was upon us. In order to meet this mighty burden we must levy a tax of staggering proportions. We must take a large part of the profits and the earnings of our people every year in order to meet these inescapable burdens.

In order to show how our Government expenses are mounting I will print a table showing the appropriations for 1921 and the estimates for 1922. The table is as follows:

Table comparing by bills estimates of regular and permanent annual appropriations for the fiscal year 1922 with the appropriations made for the fiscal year 1921.

[Prepared by the clerks to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House, Dec. 6, 1920. The column of 1921 appropriations includes the sums carried for that fiscal year in deficiency and miscellaneous appropriation acts for similar purposes. The estimated appropriations for 1922 will be found in detail in the annual Book of Estimates transmitted to Congress on Dec. 6, 1920.]

	Appropriations, fiscal year 1921.	Estimates, fiscal year 1922.	Increase (+) or decrease (—), 1922 estimates compared with 1921 appropriations.
REGULAR ANNUAL APPROPRIATION ACTS.			
Agriculture.....	\$31,712,784.00	\$41,989,384.00	+ \$10,276,600.00
Army.....	992,558,365.00	992,811,070.20	+ 300,252,705.20
Diplomatic and Consular.....	9,220,537.91	11,983,848.94	+ 2,763,311.03
District of Columbia.....	18,373,004.87	25,039,044.99	+ 6,666,040.12
Fortification.....	18,833,442.00	35,676,533.66	+ 16,843,091.66
Indian.....	10,020,555.27	11,989,703.67	+ 1,969,148.40
Legislative, executive, and judicial.....	106,570,610.11	136,452,634.97	+ 29,882,024.86
Military Academy.....	2,142,212.70	6,464,432.73	+ 4,322,220.03
Naval.....	433,279,574.00	679,515,731.47	+ 246,236,157.47
Pension.....	279,150,000.00	265,190,000.00	— 13,960,000.00
Post Office.....	504,434,700.00	585,406,962.00	+ 80,972,262.00
River and harbor.....	12,400,000.00	57,114,915.00	+ 44,714,915.00
Sundry civil.....	435,848,806.92	803,446,196.86	+ 367,597,389.94
Total, regular annual appropriation acts.....	2,254,544,592.78	3,353,080,398.49	+1,098,535,805.71

¹ Includes for 1921, \$9,218,537.91 in Diplomatic and Consular appropriation act and \$2,000 in deficiency appropriation act.

² Includes for 1921, \$104,749,326.11 in the legislative, executive, and judicial act, \$1,453,000 transferred from the sundry civil act, and \$363,284 transferred from deficiency acts.

³ This sum includes estimates for certain expenses under the Treasury Department aggregating approximately \$3,500,000, which has been paid for 1921 and prior years from the indefinite appropriations "Expenses of loans."

⁴ Includes for 1921, \$462,575,190 in Post Office appropriation act, \$41,855,510, the amount estimated to carry out the postal reclassification act, and \$4,000 in a deficiency act.

⁵ This is the amount carried in the sundry civil act plus \$75,000 carried in the deficiency act and \$125,000 in the Federal water power act and minus \$1,453,000 transferred to the legislative, executive, and judicial act.

Table comparing by bills estimates of regular and permanent annual appropriations for the fiscal year 1922 with the appropriations made for the fiscal year 1921—Continued.

	Appropriations, fiscal year 1921.	Estimates, fiscal year 1922.	Increase (+) or decrease (-), 1922 estimates compared with 1921 appropriations.
PERMANENT AND INDEFINITE APPROPRIATIONS.			
Interest on the public debt.....	\$975,000,000.00	\$922,650,000.00	- \$52,350,000.00
Sinking fund.....	253,404,864.87	265,754,864.87	+ 12,350,000.00
Expenses of loans.....	⁶ 12,499,182.96	- 12,499,182.96
Roads, construction of.....	⁷ 104,000,000.00	1,000,000.00	- 103,000,000.00
Customs service, repayments, etc.....	20,200,000.00	27,000,000.00	+ 6,800,000.00
Indian funds and interest on same.....	23,775,000.00	23,475,000.00	- 300,000.00
Miscellaneous.....	38,847,752.29	60,896,496.00	+ \$ 22,048,743.71
Increased compensation to certain employees (\$240 bonus).....	⁸ 35,000,000.00	- 35,000,000.00
Total permanent and indefinite appropriations.....	1,462,726,800.12	1,300,776,360.87	- 161,950,439.25
Grand total regular annual and permanent appropriations.....	3,717,271,392.90	4,653,856,759.36	+ 936,585,366.46
Deficiencies, 1920 and prior years.....	187,006,165.28
Railroads.....	¹⁰ 800,000,000.00
Grand total.....	¹¹ 4,704,277,558.18

⁶ The indefinite appropriation "Expenses of loans" is repealed after June 30, 1921. Expenses for such purposes are estimated for 1922 in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

⁷ The appropriations for road construction were carried for a series of years in the good roads act, approved July 11, 1916, and the Post Office appropriation act approved Feb. 28, 1919. The appropriations under those acts stop with the fiscal year 1921, except \$1,000,000 for roads in national forests.

⁸ The increase in miscellaneous permanent items is made up principally of estimated amounts as follows: \$6,500,000 in the clothing and small stores fund of the Navy, \$5,097,500 for the civil service retirement and disability fund, \$3,750,000 for payments to States from receipts under the oil leasing act.

⁹ Approximated.

¹⁰ This sum is made up as follows: \$300,000,000 for new loans to carriers and \$500,000,000 on account of Federal control of railroads. No amount is included to cover sums estimated to carry into effect the 6 months' guaranty.

¹¹ The reduction in the stated amount of appropriations made during the second session of the Sixty-sixth Congress is due to revision of the estimated amount required for the sinking fund, interest on the public debt, and expenses of loans.

What, then, is the part of wisdom? Clearly it is to cut every expense of this Government absolutely to the bone, wherever those expenses can be cut without injuring the country or without placing it in peril. If those considerations are sound, apply them, then, to the Army. The Army never produces a dollar. It eats from January to January. It consumes and it destroys. It is nothing but an expense. It is justifiable alone upon the ground of necessity; and it is incumbent upon those who demand at the close of this war that our Army shall be more than doubled to show the necessity for it. That necessity is not shown when the Secretary of War comes in here and says that if you reduce the Army to 175,000 it will interfere with some other plan that can be changed overnight.

Mr. President, I protest against a great standing Army in a time of peace. We ought to build up a National Guard in this country. We ought to have a small, highly organized, and highly efficient Regular Army. We ought to have the means by which we could quickly produce war supplies. We ought to get back to the idea that this war is over. So far as any future war is concerned in which the United States may be involved, I do not believe there has been a time within the memory of any man here when we were as little likely to have trouble with any foreign Government as at the present moment.

First, all the world lies prostrate and exhausted. We alone are able to stand erect. Why, only a little while back Great Britain debased her currency, reduced her silver money to 50 per cent of dross, a thing she had not done since the days of Henry VIII. You can get with an American dollar a bushel full of the shipplasters of two-thirds of Europe. They are in no condition to make trouble, and, in my judgment, they have no disposition to make trouble.

In the next place, Europe has learned a lesson that it will take her a hundred years to forget. European generals, European military experts, said that you could not make a soldier out of a citizen under about three years of hard training. They found in the Argonne that we could make them in about 30 days, for many a man went into the Argonne fight and into the other battles of that war who had not had 60 days of military training. I do not mean that we should not have some military training of a proper character; I am not speaking of that; but Europe learned the lesson that this great country, where men are raised in an atmosphere of freedom, produces a class of men who, if they are driven to the defense of their country, will know how to defend her; and knowing that, even though they may have a superiority of military training, they will be very slow to enter upon a conflict with the 110,000,000 people of this land.

I am not one of those jingoists who think the United States is the only country on earth, but I say to-day we are in no danger of attack. We are in no danger of attack, first, because we have done nothing to cause attack; second, because Europe is prostrate and could not attack us if she wanted to; third,

because she is not disposed to attack us; and, fourth, because the world has learned the lesson that the people of this country, standing within their seagirt shores, can beat back the embattled hosts of this earth. We do not need any 175,000 Regular Army. We do not need to make a military camp of the United States.

Singularly enough, this cry comes to us from the lips of those who at the same moment are preaching the general doctrine of disarmament. Now, I believe it will not be many years until the sensible powers of this earth will get together and put a limitation upon the size of the armies and navies by mutual consent. I hope that time is coming; but I do not think the United States is setting any very good example when it proceeds to increase its Military Establishment at a time like this. So I am in favor of a Regular Army of 150,000, and if I had my way it would go to 100,000, and I am not sure but that it would go lower than that.

Mr. President, I thank you.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I had hoped before leaving my seat to hear from the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN], who has made the motion to reconsider—to hear what could be said, relying upon the fact that, with his ability, if there was anything that could be said in favor of an Army of 175,000 men as against 150,000, he could say it. I have missed being satisfied in that regard.

Mr. President, it has been several months since the Senator from Missouri and I have agreed about anything of any very great importance, but are thoroughly agreed about this particular question. I am especially in accord with him when he says that there was "never a time in the history of these United States when we were as little likely to be drawn into war as we are now. From the time we were 13 little colonies upon the Atlantic slope to the time in the beginning of the nineteenth century when we were almost afraid of hostility with the Barbary pirates; through the War of 1812, when we were humiliatingly defeated on land everywhere except at Drury's Lane and New Orleans; when we could not put a fleet upon the sea and had to rely for our glory at sea only upon individual ships' and individual captains' and individual sailors' records; even at the end of the Civil War, when, using our arms against one another, we had shown to the whole world what we could do in a family fight—the world never through all those experiences came to a time when it was as little prepared to challenge hostilities with the United States as it is right now. Mark you, Mr. President, there is this difference: In the old times we faced the contempt of the expert military and naval classes, while sometimes we had the respect of the populace behind us. But now we have gained the military respect of the experts in the armies and the navies of the world.

The Senator is wrong in saying that we "demonstrated that we could make a soldier in 30 days." We did not do that, of course. You can make in 24 hours a fighting machine that will die, but you can not make an efficient fighting machine, which

can win against anything like equal armament, in any 30 days or in any 60 days or in any 90 days.

But, Mr. President, that is not the question before us. Unless we are going into an offensive war, in which we are to be aggressors, if we are to be on the defensive, we will have in front of the Army we may maintain here, as the first line of defense, a navy; the second Navy in the world. Mark you, Mr. President, when I say that I do not say enough. It is, strategically speaking, the first Navy in the world, because the Navy of Great Britain is necessarily scattered from the Pacific to the Indian Ocean, through the Mexican Gulf, around through the Mediterranean, and about the Isthmus of Suez, in the South Pacific, and in the China Seas. She would be incapable tomorrow of mobilizing at a given point within the waters of the Western Hemisphere a navy anywhere near equal to that which this American Republic could mobilize, unless she left all of her vast dependent dominions of alien and somewhat unfriendly people ungoverned, for it would amount to that.

The Senator from Missouri might have gone a step further, Mr. President. He might have said that not only was there never a moment in the life of this Republic—not only not an hour, or a day, or a week, or a month, but never a moment—when we were “so little likely to be challenged to a war”; but he might have added that there never was a moment when we were so well prepared for it. Two million men who went to France have for the most part come back. God bless those who did not, and those who did. Three million more men, who received from 60 to 120 days of training in military camps in America, are nearly all here. Judging by the life of veterans upon the pension roll, most of them will be here for half a century.

Mr. McKELLAR. And those men here who have had that training in actual warfare will be far better trained than the men being trained to-day.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There is no doubt about that; and, Mr. President, as the Senator from Tennessee has said, the men who received the training, who are here, and who are not wounded, and are not maimed, have received a training far superior to what this scheme in this bill will give them, for this scheme is a scheme of short training.

Mr. President, taking those two things together, I say that for the American Republic to be afraid, for the population of these United States to be afraid, is to confess themselves cowards. It is like a great, big, grown man being afraid of a child with a popgun. Where is the balance of the world? God pity it and God bless it. God pity it especially—bankrupt, insufficiently clothed, hungry. Is it seeking war? No; merely seeking shelter and food. And here we stand talking about the necessities of national defense. I would as soon go out on the street and confess myself afraid of a pregnant woman armed with a parasol.

Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri was right about another thing. The world has learned not only one thing, as the Senator said, but it has learned two, and the second is worthy of being mentioned in connection with the first which he mentioned. It has not only learned that these people of ours know how to defend not only their homes and themselves, but even their liberties and their ideals and their traditions, when questioned abroad, but it has learned that the other branch of the English-speaking race across the ocean can do all that also. I expect the Kaiser is a little bit ashamed to-day when he thinks of his reference to the old “contemptibles.” They died; they died almost to a man—Scotch Highlanders, Scotch Lowlanders, Englishmen from all the shires, Welsh Fusiliers; but there was the spirit of Richard of the Lion Heart, of King Hal, and of all the great galaxy of English-speaking heroes behind them, of the men who spoke the language which Shakespeare spoke, who thought the thoughts which Milton thought, and who dreamt the dreams which Tennyson dreamt, all of which these people outside of the sacred race, language, and its literature, its commerce, and its law, can hardly understand. They think of us somehow as “shopkeepers” over there and “money grubbers” over here; and we are, when that is what we are trying to do—to succeed in business. But they have learned now to speak of us as defenders of democracy and ideals and traditions when that is what we are trying to do.

I would “take foul scorn to myself” that I, as a part of this American Republic, should talk about us defending ourselves from an impoverished Europe, a maimed and crippled Europe, a fatherless and widowed Europe, a discordant and chaotic Europe, a mutually hating and mutually weakening Europe. But I do not know what I would take to myself—it would be worse than foul scorn—if I thought to prepare to get ready for an attack from little Japan, an attack across the Pacific Ocean from Japan. She would be bankrupt

within six weeks after she declared war against us. The whole money power of the world would be in the other scale with us and against her. All the timidity and the cowardice and the fear of the world would be in the scale with us and against her. Nearly all the civilization, the literature, and the commerce of the world would be in the scale with us against her; and besides that, she has a ruling class which has proven its wisdom, and that wisdom has counseled them to have no trouble with us unless they could have the fleet of Great Britain behind them, and even then it would be only a water fight. Do you imagine for a moment that they could ever get the fleet of Great Britain behind them? Great Britain refused to renew the late treaty except upon condition that if there were trouble between Japan and the United States England's promises were void. Why? Simply because blood is thicker than water; that language is the expression of thought, and we have a common thought; that literature is the mausoleum in which past thought is treasured up, and we have a common mausoleum; that religion makes us akin by its very heterogeneity in both countries, but nearly all Christian, professed at any rate; that the common law makes us akin; that we have the same rules of commerce and of debt payment and of commercial honor.

Mr. President, I have stood in my time in another branch of this Congress, appealing to the men of the Pacific slope in a great racial issue to save a civilized minority from a majority of veneered savages. I met with some response, but not much. They come here to-day, appealing to me in behalf of a civilized majority against a semicivilized minority.

I can understand the superior man appealing for help against an overwhelming majority of brute force, but I can not understand the superior man, when he has the majority, appealing for help against a minority of brute force.

Whence has the danger all come? Whence the need of an Army of 175,000 men, whence the need of 150,000 men, whence the need of 125,000 men, whence the need of 100,000 men?

Mr. President, let me look at the dollar side of this thing. Those of you who know me well know that is a side to which I do not often look very intently, either in my private affairs or any other affairs, because I think it is generally a secondary consideration. If a thing is worth money, no matter how much money it requires, and you have the money or can raise the money, then take it and pay for it and be done with it. But what is a dollar? It is an agreed sign and token of certain intrinsic value marking the measure of interchangeable value, amongst other things. When we come to the question of marking the interchangeable values between the wealths of peace and the glories of war there are some thoughts that must interest us.

What is a Government dollar—a dollar in the Government Treasury? My dollar is a dollar that I have earned; but what is a Government dollar? Is it a dollar that the Government has earned? No; not a Government in the world ever earned a dollar since the world began. Every dollar that drops into a Government till was first extracted from some citizen's pocket. It does not fall like manna from heaven to bless the chosen people. Some flesh-and-blood man, woman, or child works for it, delves for it, sweats for it, thinks for it, feels for it, plots for it, and more or less surely gets it, and after a while the Government takes it away in part.

What is the only excuse of the Government for taking a dollar away from me or you? It is that the Government *must* have it. Must have it for what? For a purpose higher than my individual need or use. What are the purposes higher than my individual use? Common defense, common civilization, protection of life, liberty, and property.

When we come to consider the dollar as a measure of interchangeable values between war purposes and peace purposes, what happened the other day? We saved \$35,000,000 a year on one vote. By reducing the so-called skeleton Army from 175,000 to 150,000 men we saved \$35,000,000 a year. Measured in Army men and ammunition that is what it comes to. Now, what is it measured for peace purposes? The first thought that occurs to me is that we need right now \$30,000,000 to put into fireproof hospitals for shelter for the maimed and crippled and gassed from the last war. That saving in one year would build those hospitals and leave \$5,000,000 over to go to other purposes besides the saving for the future.

But that is not all. Measure that amount of dollars in education, new schoolhouses, better-paid school-teachers. Measure it in transportation, superior and better equipment for railroads, better highways. Measure it in social uplift, if you can. It is impossible to state how you should measure it there, because every dollar put into social uplift is equal to twenty dollars spent without reproduction.

Mr. President, in this world of ours "knowledge comes, but wisdom lingers," and the trouble with men as a rule, in my opinion, is that they are always going around hunting so-called "expert" advice. The expert has knowledge, but almost never has wisdom. Nearly always all he knows is facts; all he knows is detail. His mind never rose to a conception which means a union of the mind of man with the mind of God, which constitutes wisdom, and he is always thinking about his technical training.

He is like the old fellow in Athens who wanted to hang hides on the fortress wall. After a stone-quarry man had spoken and recommended stone, and the brickmakers had recommended brick, he said, "But, after all, men of Athens, there is nothing like hides." Show me a man who has had the experience necessary to make him an expert upon petty details and I will, as a rule, show you a man who has not a general concept of any description. I will show you a man who is like the fellow who got into a dark closet with the limburger cheese, thinking that he had opened the door outdoors. When his wife asked him what about the weather, he said, "I don't know, but everything is as dark as hell and smells like cheese." He thought the entire universe—terrestrial and celestial—was one great big bundle of limburger cheese—darkness.

I have known men who would spend all the money of the Government in order to carry out a biological experiment in the Agricultural Department. I have known other men who would spend it all, or nearly all, trying to perfect the wings of an airplane. I know a number of naval and military men who would take every dollar of our annual revenues, one for the Army and leave nothing for the Navy and the other for the Navy and leave nothing for the Army, and both of them leaving nothing for civil life, for education, for social betterment, for the uplift of men and women, for making the children of the next generation better than the children of our generation, and the children of the next generation after that still better again; taking all for present might, nothing for future right.

I am tired of this everlasting prating about force. Force does not conquer in the world except primarily and for a short time. In the long run the spirit which informs force and which is behind it—traditions, ideals, and thought—conquers the utmost brute force that ever was. There is no instance of it similar in all history to that of our cousins across the sea. Not once but many times now have they prevented world dominion, totally unprepared according to all the doctrines of sailors and of soldiers.

Spain first threatened world dominion and the little ships of Britain went on, and between God's dear winds and their own sailanship the armada was scattered to the winds. Louis XIV next threatened world dominion, and the wit and wisdom, the statesmanship and sailormanship of the English-speaking race settled that little dream, and we English here in America were part of it.

Then the time came when Napoleon had a great big machine built up magnificently by the French Revolution, with an informing spirit of freedom behind it, and again the sea power and free thought of the English-speaking race defeated him, although toward the close of the struggle it was divided against itself, this part of it over here in America fighting against that part over there in Europe.

In God's name, why should I be afraid of Germany now? Ideals, such as she had, destroyed; the notion that might makes right gone to the grave; Prussian junkerdom, bankrupt, humiliated, feeling stupid; socialized industry all in anarchy. Nobody ever was much afraid of Austria nor of Hungary nor of Turkey; even the cowards were not afraid of them in peace times, before the war. And now we are going to fall back on being afraid of Japan. Let us have a great big Army to meet a possible invasion from Japan and a great big Navy to whip a Japanese Navy at sea!

Old Bismarck had a good deal of sense. One day some one said to him, "Prince, have you ever studied out a method of landing a German Army in England?" "Oh, yes," he said, "I have 20 plans, all of them perfectly feasible, but I have never studied out a plan for getting the army out of England after I landed it." Japan might land a million men on the Pacific slope to-morrow, if you can imagine it possible, and they would have California currants and fruits and grapes and a little wheat to feed on until they had been starved to death, unless they could keep control of the seas and unless, in addition to keeping control of the seas all the way back to Japan, they could keep control of the sea routes to the food-producing countries of the world, of which Japan herself is emphatically not one.

People used to make a great deal of fun of us down South for being scared about the white man's civilization. I heard

Tom Reed say once that "if he was half as much afraid of niggers as most people in the South seemed to be, he believed he would move out." But I have lived to see the day when a white man on the Pacific slope is scared of about 5 per cent of the population around him. We had at least the excuse of fearing for our civilization because it was threatened in several States by a majority of from 60 to 70 per cent, and yet in the real sense we were never scared—that is, we were not scared of the local situation. We were scared of outside interference and outside help to the numerical majority which, in our opinion, we believed to be an inferior race.

Mr. President, I wish I could hear some one say something outside of purely technical detail about "skeletons" and "full-fledged" armies, and that sort of nonsense, that could convince anybody that the Government needs even 100,000 men in the Army. I can imagine an argument in favor of the Navy; I can imagine that, although I do not think it is sound. I can easily imagine an argument in favor of an overwhelming air force. I think it is sound. But it surpasses my comprehension how we can stand here, with the blood of our ancestors on both sides of the ocean in us, and profess that we have got to have this big stick to protect ourselves against—I started to say an enemy—but not even against an enemy; against nobody; against no threat of any description. But when we come to consider that every dollar in the Government's till is taken out of the pocket of a citizen, that every dollar appropriated to one purpose is subtracted from another purpose, and that every dollar appropriated to destructive purposes is subtracted from reproductive purposes of some description, the situation is still worse.

I would rather take this \$35,000,000—the difference between an Army of 150,000 and 175,000 men—and give it to a committee to distribute amongst the deserving poor than to appropriate it to this timid, cowardly, senseless purpose. It is almost like a man buying two coffin plates for himself when he thinks he is going to die, when he ought to know that one is enough, and when God knows that he would get along very well without any at all.

I am simply yearning in every pore of my body to hear some intelligent human being utter a word showing it to be necessary or vital or even important for the American people to have 175,000 men in their Army. Oh, I have heard one argument, but that is not the argument that controls this body, I hope. The other day we voted through by a decent majority—of how much I do not remember—the motion to reduce the Army to 150,000 men; but to-day the Senate reverses itself. I have heard, and the people have heard, no reason for that reversal. It has not been avowed upon the outside, at any rate. No reasonable argument has been made for it by any man, but I have heard this morning a reason, which was given me by a very frank, intelligent, and brave man. I asked, "What do you want with all these troops?" He said, "To keep down the lawless elements in the United States." Not to meet foreign aggression, but to overcome internal discord—some yet unborn but anticipated American bolshevism, perhaps!

Mr. President, let me say this: Whenever the American people, with their magnificent middle class, their educated men, reach the point where the only thing that can keep down disorder and bolshevism is an army, their liberties and their order have already disappeared.

I was once in the town of Dijon, in France, when Gen. Chanzy was sent there by order of Marshal MacMahon to take a liberty cap off a statue. I turned to a friend of mine and said, "It is absurd to send pretty nearly a division of the French Army here to take a liberty cap off a bronze statue." He said, "But you do not know these reds, Bonnets Rouges," he called them at that time, Red Bonnets, Red Caps. He said, "If you ever let them get above the surface, all is lost." I said, "Whenever a majority of the citizenship of a country can think that, everything is already lost." Whenever the gentlemen of a country are not willing to go down in the gutter and fight its riffraff, then it has all gone anyway. So if there be in any man's heart the idea that he is going to preserve order in America against bolshevists or reds with something of an army, let him get rid of that idea. We may do it for a certain length of time, but it can not be done forever, because unless you have in the hearts and minds of your citizenship that which will overcome the anarchistic forces of revolution and chaos it is only a question of time when you must give up anyway, and life, liberty, and property cease to be secure amongst you. It all depends on your willingness to fight, to fight individually and in the gutter, and one gentleman in the gutter is equal to three of these fellows, even though he may be physically but half their strength.

You do not need this Army for foreign purposes; we do not need it for police purposes. It will hurt us economically; it

will hurt us industrially; it will hurt the great peace purposes of an enlightened civilization; it will be an absolute waste of money and will not satisfy anybody except the fellow who has been in a dark closet with nothing but limburger cheese, whether in the Navy or in the Army, and can not smell anything except military or naval affairs.

No man has a higher regard for Gen. Pershing than have I. In my opinion he made the second best military record in all this war. He made it quietly, like a gentleman; he neither rushed to the front for glory, nor went to the rear for safety. He dared the unpopularity of his men, with all the history of America behind him showing that great popular military chiefs become Presidents, in order to maintain discipline and to have an efficient army and to do the American people's work in France and in Flanders. However, when it comes to taking his advice about the size of an army, I had just as soon take a darky's advice about the fatness of a possum. Of course, the darky favors the heaviest possum. His whole education has been of a military character; his entire line of thought is toward military affairs. We might just as well take the utmost partisan in this body on the Republican side, and ask him coolly to consider the clash between his school and the opposing school of politics, or take me and ask me coolly to consider the clash between my school of politics and yours. I would do the best I could at it, but I would be utterly incapable of coming to an impartial conclusion. So with Gen. Pershing.

During Mr. WILLIAMS's speech,

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The READING CLERK. A bill (H. R. 15130) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes.

Mr. CURTIS. I understand it is the desire of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs to dispose of the pending joint resolution this afternoon. So I ask unanimous consent to lay aside temporarily the unfinished business for the purpose of considering the joint resolution only.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HARRISON. I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry. This is Calendar Monday. Is the calendar in order after 2 o'clock?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not. The Senator from Mississippi will proceed.

After Mr. WILLIAMS's speech,

Mr. BORAH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gronna	McKellar	Simmons
Beckham	Hale	McNary	Smith, Ariz.
Borah	Harris	Moses	Smith, Ga.
Brandeggee	Harrison	Myers	Smith, Md.
Calder	Heflin	Nelson	Smoot
Capper	Henderson	New	Spencer
Colt	Hitchcock	Norris	Sterling
Curtis	Johnson, Calif.	Overman	Sutherland
Dial	Johnson, S. Dak.	Page	Swanson
Dillingham	Jones, N. Mex.	Phelan	Townsend
Fall	Jones, Wash.	Phipps	Underwood
Fernald	Kellogg	Pittman	Wadsworth
Fletcher	Kenyon	Poindexter	Walsh, Mass.
France	Keyes	Pomerene	Walsh, Mont.
Frelinghuysen	King	Ransdell	Warren
Gay	Kirby	Reed	Williams
Gerry	Knox	Robinson	Willis
Gooding	La Follette	Sheppard	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). Seventy-one Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate only a moment, as I am very anxious to have this joint resolution disposed of one way or another. I prefer to have it disposed of in my way, but I want it disposed of. The sooner it is disposed of the sooner the enlistment will stop and some of the unnecessary expenditure be stopped.

If we have an Army of 175,000, we save about \$150,000,000, and if we reduce it to 150,000 we save about \$175,000,000. In other words, the difference between 150,000 and 175,000 men represents an expenditure of from twenty-five to thirty million dollars. I think those figures are generally conceded to be correct. So far, therefore, as the saving to the Treasury is concerned, there is very little dispute. Thirty million is not much, considering the reckless way we spend money, but I feel the overburdened taxpayer will be thankful for even small beginnings.

The controversy arises over the other proposition. The able Senator who is the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee stated upon last Friday, when interrogated as to the necessity of this Army, that he did not anticipate any trouble from foreign powers, but that he had in mind our domestic situation, the utilization of the Army for police purposes. I read the statement in order that I may not misquote the Senator. I asked this question:

The Senator concedes, does he not, that if we should have trouble with a foreign power 150,000 men would be just about as effective as 175,000 men?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am not anticipating trouble with any foreign power. I have in mind the demands which may come upon the Regular Army to perform what is equivalent to police duty. It has been called upon several times heretofore to perform such duty, and there is a great possibility that it may be called upon in the future to perform similar duty.

That has not only been stated upon the floor of the Senate but it has been the argument which has been passing about in the cloakrooms and elsewhere, as to the necessity of holding this Army up to 175,000 men; in other words, that the police obligation—an obligation which ought very seldom to be placed upon the Army at all—is going to require an Army of 175,000 men. The people are asked to maintain an Army of 175,000 men not to protect us from foreign foes but to protect us from ourselves. It is a far larger Army than we need for that purpose.

Mr. President, if we were considering the question of preparing for an actual conflict with some foreign power, or were considering a program of preparedness for war, I should accept the judgment of Gen. Pershing and that character of men without any hesitancy, and should abide by their views. But if we are creating an Army for police purposes, and police purposes only, I think a layman may be permitted an opinion upon that subject perhaps of equal moment with that of an expert, and I am utterly opposed to an Army of 150,000 men or 175,000 men for such a purpose. If the only object and purpose of the Army is that of police duty in the United States, we do not need it, and its presence here and the burden which it imposes upon the people are more calculated to increase discontent than to compose the situation in which we now find ourselves.

If we were going to have any difficulty with a foreign power we would not reduce this Army at all, or if anyone anticipated in the slightest way any difficulty from abroad we would not reduce it below the figure which was provided for in the Army reorganization bill. It must be, therefore, that we are placing ourselves in the position before the country of retaining an Army of 175,000 men to keep the peace in the United States, and I am unable to vote for any such proposition.

Gen. Pershing stated that there is a condition of discontent, of restlessness. I am not now quoting his exact language, because I have not seen it. I am only quoting that which he is reported in the newspapers to have stated. I know that there is an element of discontent, not only in our country, but throughout the world; but it arises not from conditions which an Army of 175,000 men will tend to settle, but from another condition of affairs, and that is the ever-increasing and growing burdens which are placed upon the people, and which the people see no way of escaping from, under the present program.

Let me call attention to the state of our expenditures at the present time. These figures were gathered by Dr. Rosa, of the Bureau of Standards:

Our appropriation in 1920 for past wars was \$3,855,482,586.

Our appropriation in the same year for education of the people of the United States was \$57,093,661.

In other words, our appropriation for past wars was 68 per cent of all the appropriations made by Congress in 1920. Our appropriation for education was 1 per cent of all the appropriations made by the Congress of the United States for 1920.

That is a more deplorable record than Germany ever had; it is an infinitely more deplorable record than the soviet government has now; and that is what is causing the discontent, the restlessness, and the utter loss of faith both in Government and in political parties to relieve the people of the burdens under which they are now bending.

Our appropriation in 1920 for future wars was \$1,424,138,677, or 25 per cent. Add that to your 68 per cent, and you have 93 per cent of all the appropriations made by Congress in 1920 for the purposes of war, past or anticipated.

Our appropriation for civil departments was \$181,087,225; for public works, \$168,203,557.

If any reason had been given to the committee or to the Senate upon which one could base action relating to anticipated difficulty, of course we would not stop with 175,000 men; but the able Senator from New York says that an Army of 175,000 men makes the Republic perfectly safe, if he is correctly quoted in an interview which was given out Saturday after

the vote, and that an Army of 150,000 renders it unsafe and insecure.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I did not give out any interview at all.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator undoubtedly saw the interview which was said to have been given out.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have not seen any interview attributed to me.

Mr. BORAH. Then I will correct that and take another cue, that the Senator is advocating here upon the floor 175,000 as rendering the situation safe, and opposing 150,000 because it would render the situation insecure and unsafe, and the difference between the two is 25,000 men. I have the utmost respect for the judgment of the Senator from New York. However, it must be an arbitrary figure, an arbitrary judgment, unless, Mr. President, it is based upon what a member of the Army told me Friday night, to wit, that if you reduce it to 150,000 you interfere with the official conditions in the United States Army.

He said he knew of one captain who had 6 men under him, and perhaps if we reduce it to 150,000 he may have but 4 men under him, which would make it very difficult, of course, for that officer to earn his money. The fact is that we have built up a vast scheme organization, and it seems necessary, in the judgment of those who are advocating 175,000 men, to keep enough men to give color at least to the necessity of the official organization. It is thought unwise to impeach in any way this great scheme, so we must have enough men to justify the scheme.

Mr. President, then there is no hope in the future of reducing the number of men at all. We must always keep 175,000 men in the field in order to give color to the maintenance of the Army organization which we have. We must take that in hand some time, and I see no reason why we should not do it now, as well as later.

We can certainly cut off twenty-five million or thirty million here if it is a mere question of protecting the domestic situation, better than we can deprive the men who went into the Great War—and who have come home disabled, crippled, afflicted for life—of the hospital necessities which they are entitled to have. I am informed that they eliminated in the House the other day, either before the committee or in the House, a proposed appropriation of some \$20,000,000 to build hospitals, and I am also informed by a party who is in a position to know that the young men who went into the war are traveling upon the streets and running at large in a mental condition which makes them unsafe to the community, and that men afflicted with the dreadful disease of tuberculosis are dropping dead upon the streets for want of care and protection.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. REED. I take it the Senator is familiar with the fact that the charge has been made in the press that a number of these ex-soldiers have been put in public almshouses by the Government and are maintained there along with the pauper patients. There was a "whitewash" report denying that occurrence, which I have had some occasion to examine, and I affirm that it is true; that they did that very thing in the city of Chicago.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I am sure that no Senator here who has examined into the situation will deny that the condition of affairs is deplorable in that respect. We feel under the necessity of cutting down those appropriations. We feel under the necessity of curtailing expenses in those regards. It does seem to me, Senators, that if it is a mere matter of protecting our domestic situation, if we anticipate no trouble from abroad—and none has been pointed out—that it is the part of wisdom, it is the part of patriotism, to disregard the mere Army organization, for a season at least, and transfer the twenty-five million to the boys who served in the Great War, who are dying for the want of care. I venture to say that we will continue to trim and curtail in such instances, rather than in this matter.

I do not criticize those who think we ought to have 175,000 men, but I do think that they ought to state a reason other than the mere fact that it is an arbitrary figure which has been fixed by those who are interested in the Army reorganization bill. This is a serious matter, this piling up these great expenditures which a discouraged and anxious people will have to pay. We are pledged to economy and we are also pledged by every principle of humanity to care for the brave fellows who contracted disease in the service of the Nation. Let us act in good faith with the taxpayers and cut to the bone. Let us save

everywhere we can for another reason, and that is that we may deal in decency and justice with the crippled and the afflicted.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I have been in favor of an Army of 175,000 men, but the arguments made by the Senator from Idaho, and by others who preceded him, have weakened me in my position. Does the Senator think that if we eliminate 25,000 men, if we reduce the number from 175,000 to 150,000, we can use the money saved toward taking care of the very men he is talking about, some of whom are wandering on the streets of my home town suffering from tuberculosis and with no place to go? I am informed that the city of Prescott, with five or six hundred beds, is not able to take care of half of the ex-soldiers who are seeking some sort of relief, and I confess that I shall be led to vote with the Senator in the hope that we may divert all of the money possible to the aid of those men who were hurt in the last war.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I am unable to assure the Senator that we can transfer it, but the Senator knows, as well as I, that if we continue making expenditures of this class it will be absolutely necessary that we cut somewhere, and we will cut those who are dying rather than those who are still exerting power.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. KING. Has the Senator made any investigation with a view to ascertaining whether or not those who have charge of the appropriations made to care for these disabled soldiers have properly expended the money? If the Senator will pardon me, my recollection is that we appropriated for the current year some two or three hundred million dollars. I have heard many complaints of inefficiency and maladministration by the boards which have charge of the expenditure of that money. It has been charged that if they had properly applied it, the evils of which the Senator complains would not exist; that there was an ample amount appropriated to properly care for all of the wounded and disabled men, but that the boards that have had the expenditure of the money have been grossly inefficient, have wasted the money, have consumed it in salaries and in useless and unnecessary expenditures. Can the Senator give us any information as to that?

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. ASHURST. On last Saturday morning I read to the Senate a letter from the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, in which he pointed out that, in round numbers, 10,000 beds are urgently needed for discharged soldiers who are afflicted either with tuberculosis, or neuro-psychiatry—that is, insane men—and he pointed out that those ex-soldiers were absolutely without facilities of hospitalization, that 10,000 beds were urgently needed, and he urged that Congress should pass the bill introduced by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE], and reported favorably to the Senate, that 10,000 beds, at \$3,000 apiece, be provided, making the appropriation \$30,000,000. It was stated this morning on the floor of the Senate that \$10,000,000 would be appropriated. I ask Senators to read the letter from the Surgeon General, and I ask them, why do you select the arbitrary figure of \$10,000,000, when you require \$30,000,000 to hospitalize 10,000 men?

Why should not the Appropriations Committee bring in an amendment appropriating \$30,000,000, as the Surgeon General requests and the necessities demand?

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. WARREN. Answering the Senator from Arizona, I will say that the sundry civil appropriation bill came from the House carrying total appropriations of \$380,000,000. Two hundred and twenty-three million dollars of that is for the very purpose mentioned by the Senator, and like purposes, all for War Risk, vocational education, and the Public Health Service, leaving but about \$160,000,000 for all other purposes for the entire United States.

If the Senator will permit me further, that bill is before us, and exactly what the Senator has mentioned is a very live subject. We have had before us the head officer of the Public Health Service; we had before us as lately as this morning the active officer of the vocational education service, and we propose to do something, we propose to do all that ought to be

done, in the judgment of the Appropriations Committee, in the present year, in this appropriation bill, unless in the meantime we shall have here passed a bill which has been reported to the House favorably from the committee, and for which, I understand, a special rule has been adopted, which is likely to bring the measure up at any moment, because it would reach the President sooner than would the appropriation bill. But the matter is having attention.

Mr. BORAH. Is the Appropriations Committee prepared to take care of the appropriation asked for by the Surgeon General?

Mr. WARREN. The Surgeon General does not expect \$30,000,000 the coming fiscal year, and we expect to give all that can be used in starting the work. These figures as to the number of patients are predicated upon the figures given by actuaries of insurance companies, and cover what they think we shall have to provide for in the future.

Mr. BORAH. I am speaking of taking care of those boys who will not have to be taken care of a year from now. They will be called hence long before that time unless they are taken care of at once.

Mr. WARREN. Does the Senator allude to those who are in the hospitals now?

Mr. BORAH. Those who are in and those who are unable to get in.

Mr. WARREN. Those who are unable to get in? Surely there is nothing to prevent them from coming in, for the money has been appropriated and is available for the purpose.

Mr. BORAH. They have not the hospitals to put them in.

Mr. WARREN. I have not the testimony before me, but the testimony of the Surgeon General is that no soldier is allowed to suffer. But they have to rent hospitals here and there, rent buildings which are not properly fitted for the purpose, and use the temporary structures erected during the war, which he very justly wants to replace with good hospitals.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, in view of what the chairman of the Appropriations Committee has just said, I wish to remind him that I was told some time ago that in one of the hospitals for the treatment of tubercular patients the rule was that patients could be kept there for a certain number of weeks for observation and treatment, and in the event that they were pronounced incurable, at the end of that time they would have to leave the hospital, and no provision was made for them thereafter. I do not know that that is true, but it came to me in such a way as to challenge my belief. If it is true, certainly all who believe in the principles of humanity would be in favor of taking care of them, and giving them the very best care possible.

Mr. WARREN. If that is true, as the Senator states, it is because of the acts of the board having the matter in charge, and not because of a lack of appropriations, or care on the part of Congress.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, does the Senator from Wyoming say that there has been no lack of appropriations to take care of the situation, with reference to ex-soldiers afflicted with disease, as those appropriations have been thought to be necessary by the department?

Mr. WARREN. Every dollar that has been asked for by the department for the care of soldiers has been furnished from time to time, going up to the 1st of July, and there are sums in some accounts that have not all been used, while other branches have caused deficiencies, and those deficiencies have been reported now to the House and are under consideration in the deficiency appropriation bill which will soon follow. This does not, however, cover the sundry civil bill, now being considered by the Senate Committee on Appropriations, as to hospitals, which are proposed to be cared for by the Senate and added to the bill.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, then the fault must lie elsewhere, because I have letters, and I presume many other Senators have letters, from soldiers who are in hospitals in which we ought not to keep horses, let alone men; buildings which are wholly unfitted for the use to which they are being put, with conditions surrounding those boys that we would not think of allowing to exist where an ordinary individual was suffering from ill health. I do not know where the fault lies. I only know that there is a condition of affairs which is most deplorable in regard to it. I can not search it out here now.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, assuming it to be true that 10,000 beds are urgently needed, and Congress does not supply the money, then where does the fault lie? With Congress, manifestly.

I ask the Senator to allow me to interrupt him until I read from the letter of the Surgeon General, which I read into the

RECORD. It is three days old. The Surgeon General wrote me as follows, and I read the concluding paragraph:

In round numbers 10,000 beds are urgently needed, of which the beds for tubercular and neuropsychiatric patients are of the greatest urgency. These additional beds will serve only to meet the present needs of the increase expected within the present fiscal year.

At the estimated cost of \$3,000 per bed, the 10,000 beds urgently needed would require an appropriation of \$30,000,000. The amount authorized by S. 4357—\$29,530,000—is approximately correct. From the best advice obtainable, it is not believed that the estimate of \$3,000 per bed for hospital construction is excessive. Indeed, unless there is a further decline in the cost of material and labor, it is doubted whether this estimated cost would be sufficient.

Mr. WARREN. We have the testimony of the Surgeon General, and he elaborates more fully the necessities to which the distinguished Senator from Arizona has alluded. What he proposes to do as soon as other buildings can be erected, which, of course, would take time, is to remove the patients entirely from a large share of buildings that are now used for hospitals, and hence the necessity, which the Senator mentions, for 10,000 beds.

Mr. BORAH. One thing seems to be quite evident as a mathematical proposition, that if we transfer the \$30,000,000 which is necessary to maintain an Army of 175,000 instead of an Army of 150,000, we will have money to take care of the men. That seems to be certain. Otherwise, if we were to take care of them, of course, it must be by increasing the taxes and increasing the burden. Assuming that we do take care of them, we can take care of them by this expenditure.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] have shown beyond a shadow of doubt that we do not need a great standing Army to defend ourselves from foreign foes at this time. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] has certainly shown that we do not need it for policing in our own country. It seems to me that at this time, when the whole world is talking about disarmament, the United States of America was never in a better position, and no nation was ever in so good a position, to set a good example to the world in the matter of disarmament by reducing our Army to the minimum. We have a chance now to show to the world that we have confidence in the disarmament idea. Will we do it? Have we the courage to do it? Have we the grit to stand against the beginning of a military oligarchy which we gave birth to in the Army reorganization act? I hope we have.

My understanding from the newspapers is that President-elect Harding, a distinguished former Member of this body, is about to base an agreement for a world association, as he calls it, upon the theory of disarmament, upon the plan of disarmament among the nations. If so, he deserves credit for having one good view about it, at least. It seems to me that his colleagues in the Senate, regardless of party affiliation, ought to uphold him in this high resolve. It is a great move in the right direction. We ought not only to aid him, but we ought to set the example in the very beginning, and we have the opportunity now in cutting down our Army to 150,000.

Let us see what the joint resolution before the Senate really provides. Last May Congress passed what was known as the Army reorganization bill, providing for an Army of 280,000 enlisted men and about 18,000 officers. I voted against that bill.

I thought that the organization was too large and that the number of enlisted men was too large. I did not think we needed such a large establishment as that provided for. I agreed with the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] when he said he thought such an organization was top-heavy. I thought that adequately described the situation at the time. I think so now.

While the bill was passed providing for an Army of that size, when it came to appropriate for the number of men in the Army, Congress did not appropriate for 280,000 men. It appropriated for only 175,000 men. It was then argued that we would not get 280,000, nor even 175,000 men. Some Senators voted for the 175,000 because it was assumed that we would not get that many men. Mr. Secretary Baker came along and took the view that the law authorized and directed him to recruit the Army up to 280,000 men. Surely he had the right to take that view. There was the plain letter of the law authorizing him to recruit up to 280,000 men, and if Congress had not believed that we ought to have the 280,000 men it was perfectly natural that the query should arise in his mind, "Why did they put it in the law?" He is within the letter of the law when he endeavors to recruit it up to the larger number, and we all agree about that.

While that was put on the statute books, however, Congress, it is true, only appropriated for 175,000 men. That was not fair to the Secretary. It was not fair to the administration, and it was not fair to the Government.

While Mr. Baker and I disagree on many subjects, I do not think that he has violated the law with reference to recruiting the Army as he has been doing. What has he done? He recruited the Army until we now have some 230,000 men. Our friends say we must reduce it, and in that I heartily concur. The only difference between us is the extent of the reduction.

I think the joint resolution ought to pass, but what does it accomplish? Let us see what it accomplishes. We talk a great deal about reduction and how much the joint resolution is going to accomplish. We have 230,000 men now and if the joint resolution passes providing for a maximum of 175,000, in the course of about 16 months, under the amendment which was added to the bill on last Friday, it will be reduced to 175,000. In other words, the Army will be reduced in about 16 months the difference between 230,000 and 175,000. We will have an average number of about 200,000 after all in the Army when Congress has only appropriated for 175,000.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. Do I understand it to be the Senator's view that if the joint resolution is passed reducing the Army to 175,000 it will, in fact, be 16 months before it actually is reduced to that number?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is my judgment about the matter, and I will give the Senator the reason for my judgment.

Mr. POMERENE. Allow me to suggest that if that is true we ought to pass the joint resolution immediately.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree with the Senator that we ought to pass the joint resolution immediately, and I think we ought to pass it providing for 150,000 enlisted men, so as to get it down within a reasonable time to something nearer what I believe to be the right number.

Mr. POMERENE. If it will take 16 months to reduce the Army to 175,000, how long will it take to reduce it to 150,000?

Mr. McKELLAR. It would take much longer, but at the same time we would be traveling in the right direction under the law. I wish to explain to the Senator from Ohio and to the Senate, before we go any further, just why it is going to be so. It was estimated that it would be reduced to 175,000 by next September. There are many branches of the service, notably, I think, the Infantry branch, the most important branch, which have not been recruited up to the number they would have under the 175,000 plan. We passed an amendment on Friday last providing that enlistments shall not be discontinued in those branches where 62½ per cent, I believe, as it is now, have not been secured; so that we will be continuing enlistments in those branches of the service as before, and we will only be reducing in those branches of the service where they already have an overplus. I think that it will take at least 16 months to bring the total number of the Army down under the joint resolution to 175,000 men.

It is argued that Mr. Secretary Baker and Gen. Pershing testified before the committee last Friday, and that their testimony very strongly supports the 175,000 plan. Unfortunately, I did not know that they were going to appear before the committee, and had an engagement at one of the departments, and so missed hearing them testify. But I have their testimony before me, and I wish to read Secretary Baker's position upon the matter. First, he is offered as a witness as to why we should accept the 175,000 figure. I read:

Senator FRELINGHUYSEN. We place in the Army reorganization bill a skeleton organization, and do you feel that skeleton organization will be impaired if the Army is reduced to 175,000 men?

Secretary BAKER. It will be impaired, Senator, but it will not be so sensibly impaired as to make it a very serious matter if it is a temporary thing. I understand the disposition of Congress, and I am in the profoundest sympathy with it. It is to economize, and I think the Army could get along with 175,000 until the present necessity for economy was somewhat relieved, but I think then it ought to be increased to 250,000 at least.

Senator JOHNSON. The disposition, I want to make plain to you, will be to make this reduction to 175,000, and I think I speak with accuracy in this regard, and the next thing that will be done will be not to increase it but to reduce it further. That is the disposition, I think, all along the line, and that is in the atmosphere.

Secretary BAKER. I think it is in the atmosphere. I think the world is strongly desirous of reducing the size of armies and reducing the size of armaments, and I know of no more wholesome or helpful thing to do than to bring that about.

In substance it will be noted this last statement contradicts his first statement, but is at war with his whole course of conduct in attempting to recruit the Army up to 280,000 men, as has been his professed purpose.

Here is the Secretary of War, who is recruiting the Army above the number that Congress has appropriated for. Congress appropriated for 175,000, and the Secretary of War has recruited up to 230,000 and is continuing recruiting day by day. He says that it will be unsafe to reduce it below 250,000. He

does not make any distinction between 175,000 and 150,000, or if he does, he takes it back in the very next sentence. He says that he knows of no more helpful thing to do than to bring it about. He regards the 280,000 provision in the Army reorganization bill as a mandate to him and has been acting upon that mandate. In one breath he says it ought to be carried out, and we ought to have at least 250,000 men, and in the next breath he says he knows of no more helpful thing to do than to reduce it. Is that testimony upon which we can act here? It seems to me not, but that we ought to act upon our own judgment.

Much has been said about Gen. Pershing's testimony, and I wish to call the attention of the Senate for a moment to his testimony. He never made the distinction that is being made here. Gen. Pershing said:

Well, I said in my reply to the Senator, I think at this time it should not be reduced below 200,000. It seems to me it is getting on dangerous ground if we undertake to do too much at this time, with the world's affairs as they appear to be now.

That is the excuse he gives for it. There is no specific reason given and there is no specific reason that exists in the country to-day for a big Army. It seems to me we ought to set an example to the other nations of the world. We have some 3,000,000 young men in the country splendidly trained now, amply able to defend the country almost on a moment's notice. We have their names and we can bring them into an army whenever we will. Congress is almost constantly in session. Why should we build up this large skeleton Army, as it is called? What necessity is there for it? We do not expect any war.

There is no nation on earth that could possibly think of coping with us on the field of battle or in battle on the seas. There is no reason in the world at this time which has been offered by anybody for an army of the size proposed. It has been suggested, rather inferentially, that there may be trouble in this country, but no real reason is given for this proposed trouble. The President elect of the United States is urging disarmament throughout the country; he has given out interviews in favor of disarmament. The Republican Senate say they are in favor of disarmament; the Republican Senate say they wish to reduce the Army. Well, if you are going to reduce it, why not reduce it in a manner which will do some good? Why make only a pretense at it? Under this joint resolution we are scarcely proposing to reduce the Army at all. It will take more than a year to reduce the Army to 175,000 men; and that is twice as many men as we had before the war, for we all know that we only had about 75,000 men on an average for a number of years before the war, in our Army, and hardly that many. We did not need them, and we do not need them now.

I understand that while the President of the United States agreed at the peace conference to leave 7,500 men on our portion of the line on the Rhine in Germany, to-day we have now some 14,800 men there, and have had that number of men there all the time—about double the number of men the President agreed should stay there. Why are those men kept there? What necessity is there for the excess number? The Secretary of War in this very statement testifies that the department has recruited men and sent them over there to replace some of the men whose enlistments expired.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think the Senator from Tennessee can not have read the testimony.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have the testimony before me and am reading from it. I will turn to the testimony and see if I have made a mistake. I desire to correct it if I have, but my understanding is as I have stated.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The statement was made perfectly plain to the committee, and if the Senator had been present he would have known it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be glad to have the Senator from New York explain it. I wish to be corrected if I am wrong. But I have the testimony before me.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It was agreed upon while the peace conference was in session that 7,500 or 8,000 men should be the American contribution for the army of occupation on the Rhine. After that agreement was made the allied powers came to an agreement to send forces to Silesia, and our administration, for reasons thought good by the President, I assume, decided to contribute 5,000 men to police a referendum or a public election in Silesia.

That force was sent from the United States. When it reached Europe it was halted and not allowed to go to Silesia, but ended upon the Rhine. As a matter of fact, as the terms of enlist-

ment of the men now stationed under Gen. Allen on the Rhine expire they are brought home and no men are sent to take their places.

Mr. McKELLAR. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to ask the Senator if it is not true that there are some 14,000 or 15,000 men now on the Rhine?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I can give the exact number. There are now on the Rhine 14,800 men.

Mr. McKELLAR. I now desire to read the testimony which I have before me. Senator Knox asked the question:

How many have we in Europe?

Gen. PERSHING. I think something like 12,000.

Secretary BAKER. I think 14,000.

Senator KNOX. How are they located?

Gen. PERSHING. They are all located upon the Rhine. The original number to be left there was 7,500; that was agreed upon in conference when the President was there. It was about as small an amount as could be organized, to be given any sort of balance. They have a little artillery and some cavalry. I think they have organized the cavalry since, but with auxiliary troops and everything necessary there are a fixed number at 7,500. After that there were some 5,000 sent over, originally intended for service in Silesia, but were never sent to Silesia. I think they were stopped on the Rhine and made a part of the command under Gen. Allen, whose headquarters were at Coblenz; and I presume that has been followed up by recruitments sent over from time to time, making now something like 14,000 men.

Mr. President, instead of taxing the American people for 25,000 additional men at this time, at a cost of some \$35,000,000 or \$40,000,000—because that is what we are proposing to do when we adopt the proposition to fix the number at 175,000 men instead of fixing the number at 150,000—why can we not bring the 7,500 additional men now on the Rhine back to this country and use them in our Army here and thus save the American people this great expense?

Mr. FLETCHER. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. I desire to say that the testimony shows that the United States is not put to a dollar of expense by reason of the maintenance of the Army on the Rhine or for the pay of the men.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad the Senator has brought that fact forward, because I desire in just a moment to explain what the testimony shows about that. The testimony does not uphold the statement of the Senator.

Mr. FLETCHER. The testimony also shows that those men are coming home very rapidly, so that within the next month or two—I forget the exact figures, but I remember a statement was made as to enlistments expiring, and so forth—they will be coming home at the rate of something like 1,000 a month, or even more than that.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, sir; that is always the excuse given; that excuse is always ready; that we are going to do something in the future; that we are going to reduce the Army, for instance, but we do not do it. The joint resolution is in large part exactly of that character. It says that we are going to reduce the number to 175,000, but we shall not do it for a long, long time. Now, let me read on a little further.

Secretary BAKER. But they have got as high as 16,000 at one time by refilling the vacancies—

We are recruiting in this country for the purpose of keeping 15,000 men on the Rhine, when the contract which the President made at Versailles was that we should keep but 7,500 men there.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Why does not the Senator desire to be fair?

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, I desire to be fair. I am fair. I am reading from the testimony.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator is not reading all of it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will read it all.

Mr. WADSWORTH. He would not make the last statement if he had read it all.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will read it all here and now, for I have nothing before me except the testimony given to the committee.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Very well; read it all. Even, I may say, a member of the Republican majority has to ask fairness in the treatment of a Democratic Secretary of War.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know about that, but I will stop long enough here to say that I have my doubts about it. The joint resolution advocated by the Senator is a criticism of the Secretary of War; the joint resolution reported out by the Senator from New York is a direct criticism of the Secretary's action in recruiting the Army as he has recruited it. By the way, I wish to say that I am not in the attitude of a critic of Mr. Baker, the Secretary of War. He has legal authority to recruit, and every Senator knows it. The Senator brought forth a bill here

last year which, in words, gave him authority to recruit up to 280,000 men. I have defended Secretary Baker as to his authority. I am opposed to his exercise of that authority. Now, this joint resolution is a criticism of Secretary Baker for doing what the Republican majority, in language which could not be mistaken, authorized and directed him to do.

However, I hold no brief for Secretary Baker. I owe him no defense. I do not recall his ever having considered the interests of my State when they have come before him. In the six years he has been Secretary, Tennessee has received short shift at his hands. So that I am all the more free to uphold him when he is right and criticize him when I believe he is wrong. In exercising the authority to recruit the Army up to 280,000, as you authorized him, he is clearly right. In the policy of carrying out your directions he is clearly wrong.

I now read:

Secretary BAKER. But they have got as high as 16,000 at one time by refilling the vacancies; but that has been suspended for some months. As enlistments—

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is what I wanted to call to the attention of the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am reading that statement. I had simply not got to it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. But the Senator made a statement to the Senate before he read it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am reading the whole thing; I am not going to be unfair to any man, if I know it, whether he be an officer, or Secretary, or whoever he may be.

As enlistments expire the men return to this country, and no fresh replacements are being sent over.

He does not say when that was; he says "recently."

Mr. WADSWORTH. He said "for some months."

Mr. McKELLAR. "For some months"; yes.

Senator NEW. I see that it is proposed to bring home all but about 8,000 men. I saw a newspaper announcement to that effect yesterday. On what was that based?

Secretary BAKER. It was based on the expiration of enlistments. As Gen. Pershing said, the original force was something like 7,500 men, but while the Peace Congress was still in session in Paris it was arranged that a part of Gen. Pershing's army should be retained for service in Silesia. These troops had been there a long time, and instead of retaining them there, with their period of enlistment, we brought them home and sent another contingent—

I will stop long enough there to call the Senator's attention to the fact that he said that these troops were intended for Silesia. They originally were intended for Silesia. Then they came home, but others were sent to the Rhine to take their places, according to the Secretary of War.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I stated the fact with absolute accuracy. I said that 5,000 men were sent from this country to serve in Silesia, but were stopped on the Rhine and did not go to Silesia.

Mr. McKELLAR. But the Senator did not state all of the fact, because those troops were sent back and another 5,000 were sent over to the Rhine to take the place of the first 5,000, according to Mr. Baker's testimony. I read further from the testimony:

Those troops had been there a long time, and instead of retaining them there, with their period of enlistment we brought them home and sent another contingent of about 5,000 over to take their places. They were attached to Gen. Allen's command at Coblenz to keep it up to the full strength. As their commissions and enlistments—

I assume that he means 16,000, or more than double the strength that it was originally intended to retain there by the President at Versailles.

As their commissions and enlistments are expiring, they are all coming home, and we are not sending any more replacements; so that by about the middle of May the force will get down to what it was originally designed to be.

Senator NEW. That was my understanding of it, and it was in order to develop that that I asked that question. The whole thing comes down to the point, then, that you are simply not replacing the expiring enlistments?

Secretary BAKER. That is right, sir.

Senator NEW. These men are coming home individually and as casuals, and there is no fixed purpose to bring home any considerable number of them in one outfit?

Secretary BAKER. That is right, Senator.

Now we come to the matter of pay. I shall read what the witnesses testified, because I myself do not recall exactly what was said.

The CHAIRMAN. What portion of the expense does Germany pay?

Secretary BAKER. It pays all of it, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Including the pay of the troops?

Senator WARREN. It agrees to pay it.

Secretary BAKER. Well, they sent us some money; I do not know how much.

The CHAIRMAN. The pay of the officers and men?

Secretary BAKER. Yes, sir; that is my understanding.

Gen. PERSHING. Oh, yes; I think it was paid up to about September, 1919. I do not know what they have done since then.

Secretary BAKER. I have had checks since then, and Gen. Allen reported not long ago that he had marks enough on hand to pay all the expenses of his force.

Senator BECKHAM. I would like to ask Gen. Pershing, in line with Senator Johnson's question, what he thinks of the proposed reduction of the Army to 150,000?

Gen. PERSHING. Well, I said in my reply to the Senator, I think at this time it should not be reduced below 200,000 men. It seems to me it is getting on dangerous ground if we undertake to do too much at this time with the world's affairs as they appear to be now.

That is the testimony of Gen. Pershing in regard to the size of the Army.

Mr. President, it does not seem to me that the testimony of either Mr. Baker or Gen. Pershing is important as to this question now before the Senate. Both are asking for more than 200,000. Neither asking for the 175,000 men.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, even if they are correct, we are not following them. Gen. Pershing says we should not reduce the Army below 200,000, but the committee proposes to disregard his recommendations.

Mr. McKELLAR. A majority of the committee propose to disregard Gen. Pershing's recommendations, and all the committee propose to disregard the recommendations of the Secretary of War. The statement has been made that I am criticizing the Secretary of War. I am stating the fact when I say that the whole committee desires to disregard his recommendations, and apparently his testimony is being used simply to prove what he has done is wrong. It is a strange defense of the Secretary. The purpose of the pending joint resolution is to disregard the Secretary of War in toto. He has brought the Army up to 230,000 men and is recruiting it still further, and says it ought not to be less than 250,000 men.

Mr. President, it seems to me it is our duty to act upon our knowledge and judgment in the matter, in accordance with the time-honored traditions of this Republic, for the benefit of all the people, and save this large difference in the cost of the Army. Thirty-five million dollars or \$40,000,000 is still a considerable sum of money. If properly used it would do much good.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will pardon me for a moment, we all know that the actual difference in effectiveness between a skeleton Army of 150,000 men and a skeleton Army of 175,000 could not be told by any expert.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield right there?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield. I beg the Senator's pardon. I must yield to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS] first. He first interrupted.

Mr. ROBINSON. It is right on that point that I want to ask the Senator a question, with the indulgence of both the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Montana. In view of that fact and a consideration of the subject generally, and in view of the further fact, as stated by the Senator from Tennessee, that the reduction to 175,000 can not possibly be accomplished before the first or last of September, does not the Senator think that we might dispose of this matter by making the reduction suggested by the Senator from New York and proceed to other business? Otherwise, the end of September may come before we finally dispose of it.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true. I am willing to take a reduction to 175,000 if we can not get the 150,000, but I am very much in favor of reducing it to the lower number; and I want to say to the Senator from Arkansas that while the thirty or forty million dollars which would be saved is not a matter of very much moment to many Senators it is, to my humble way of thinking about it, a very important matter. I would a thousand times rather vote to devote this thirty or forty million dollars to looking after and protecting and keeping up the maimed, wounded, and tuberculosis-cursed boys who have already been serving their Government in the Army, who are now without proper hospital service, as has been shown here, than to add to the Army this additional number of 25,000 men that are wholly useless at this time. I think the Senator from Arkansas is mistaken in saying that we are losing time or wasting time when we are endeavoring, first, to lower the tax burdens upon the people of this country and also in endeavoring to use this money for the benefit of those who are entitled to it, who have already given most of their lives to their country.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON. But the point I am making is that, according to the Senator's own argument, we could make this reduction now to 175,000, and before that is concluded we could give further consideration to the subject, if necessary, and provide for any other reduction that may be deemed advisable; but if we continue to debate the subject indefinitely there is likely to be no action.

Mr. McKELLAR. But why take two bites at a cherry when you can take it with one just as easily?

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MYERS. I wanted to make a remark in connection with the suggestion made by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] a few minutes ago. Reference was made to the fact that Gen. Pershing opposes any reduction below 200,000. That is true; and yet while it is his opinion that the number of enlisted men should not be reduced below 200,000, he says it could be reduced to 175,000 without totally impairing the framework on which the Army is founded, but that if you go below 175,000 you destroy the foundation upon which the reorganized Army was built and would have to do it all over again.

Mr. McKELLAR. Did Gen. Pershing say what the foundation or framework was? I do not find it in his testimony here. He merely makes that as an excuse for not reducing it. Why, Gen. Pershing, from his point of view, would not reduce the Army at all. He would increase it. He is a military man, and one of the greatest in the world, but, of course, he looks at all these questions from a military standpoint.

Mr. MYERS. He gave an explanation of it further on, about so many units and regiments being required on which to expand, and that if we went below 175,000 we would not have them.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; but when we come to look into what has been done under the present Army reorganization act we find that the staff units of the Army have been enlisted to a greater strength than they ought to have been enlisted to, whereas the infantry, or fighting units, have not been enlisted up to their full strength.

Mr. MYERS. I know that Gen. Pershing says in effect that if Congress sees fit we can reduce the Army to 175,000, although against his judgment, without destroying the foundation on which it is constructed, but that if we go below 175,000 we are virtually destroying the foundation on which the house is built. He is a military expert, and I am willing to take his judgment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no. The Senator is mistaken about that. He does not say that.

Mr. MYERS. He did not use those words, but that was the effect of what he said.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; if you want to follow the advice of Gen. Pershing, do not vote for 175,000, because he is opposed to it. He says you will destroy those units if you bring the Army down below 200,000.

Mr. MYERS. There is more there on the subject. He says that you destroy it all the more if you go below 175,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. He does not say that. That may be the argument which the Senator has in his own mind, but Gen. Pershing does not say that.

Mr. MYERS. That was advanced while he was testifying, either by him or by some Senator, and he assented to it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Perhaps so, but this record does not show it.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. DIAL. Would it not be well if we could take some steps to stop the recruiting of officers as well as to stop the recruiting of enlisted men?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am not prepared to agree to that. The Army reorganization act, as I recall, provides for about 18,000 officers, and they have commissioned up to date about 14,000, and there are now about 4,000 less than the number required. I do not know whether or not the Secretary takes the same view about decreasing the number of officers that he does about decreasing the number of men. I think they have a rule now that officers can only come up from second lieutenants.

Mr. DIAL. That is on the assumption, though, that we are going to have an Army of about 280,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. The 18,000 was on the assumption—I am giving round numbers, of course—that we would have an Army of 280,000 men.

Mr. DIAL. Now, if we should reduce the Army down to 150,000 or 175,000, we would need less officers than we would for an Army of 280,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator may think so; but I think it is very much more important to have a larger number of officers proportionately than of men, for the reason that we can bring men into the Army very rapidly, while it takes some time, it takes years, to train officers. I am rather inclined to think that we ought not to reduce the number of officers.

Mr. DIAL. I agree to that proposition as a rule, but it does seem to me that there is a very great disproportion.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I regret very much that the Senate has seen fit to change its views since last Friday. On last Friday, by a substantial majority, the Senate held that 150,000 men in the Army were enough. This morning, by a very much larger majority, the Senate went the other way. I regret it very much. I hope that the amendment for 175,000 may be defeated, and that we may have 150,000 in our Army.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I am very anxious—as others are, no doubt—to reach a conclusion of this discussion, and I shall not delay the action upon it. I do, however, feel called upon to say just a word in view of the remarks which have been made to the effect that we could use the amount of money required over and above the amount necessary to provide for 150,000 to 175,000 enlisted men for taking care of the disabled and the injured.

Of course, it would seem unnecessary to say, although the arguments made rather call for an expression of that kind, that no Member of this body who favors enlistment up to 175,000 men is in favor of decreasing in any amount whatsoever the provisions which ought to be made for disabled or wounded or otherwise incapacitated men by reason of their service. On the other hand, I favor taking care of those men to the limit, and I believe Congress will do it. The country demands it, considerations of humanity require it, and everyone who favors this provision for the Army certainly favors taking care of the incapacitated and the disabled men in every respect whatsoever, no matter to what extent it may be necessary to go.

We must make provision for those men. It is our duty to do it, and we will do it. I have not any question about that. It makes no difference whether the joint resolution provides for 175,000 or 150,000 men; that has nothing to do with the question of taking care of the incapacitated and the disabled. That is going to be done, anyhow.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FLETCHER. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. According to the testimony that was read a while ago, it is very far from being done at present. There are a great many tuberculosis patients that are not being cared for.

Mr. FLETCHER. I understand that already provision of a temporary character has been made for taking care of those men, and that further provision will be made as the bills are considered by the committees which are now handling them. That situation will be met independently of any question as to what is done with regard to this joint resolution and the number of enlisted men provided for hereafter in the Army.

The arguments made by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] lead us to this: Why have any Army at all? If you can save \$30,000 by striking off 25,000 men, why not save \$50,000 by striking off 40,000 men, and why not save a million dollars by striking off a few more men, and finally we get to the point where we do not need to have any Army at all, and we will take the whole amount of money and use it for constructive purposes.

Of course, you can do that if you want to; but one Government after another has been committing suicide for the last four years. Austria-Hungary committed suicide. I suppose we can do it if we want to do it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator that I know he does not want to misstate what I have said.

Mr. FLETCHER. No.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am not in favor of having no Army. I am in favor of a proper Army. This Army will be twice as large as we had before the war if it is reduced to 150,000. The Senator talks about Austria committing suicide. The Senator knows that the reason why Austria had to commit suicide was because for many generations she maintained one of the greatest standing armies in Europe.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I was about to remark that Austria-Hungary committed suicide by increasing her army, not by reducing it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Why, of course.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for one moment?

Mr. FLETCHER. Austria-Hungary committed suicide by a very foolish, absurd, ridiculous, asinine move or policy—

Mr. McKELLAR. Well, we do not want to follow it.

Mr. FLETCHER. Not by reason of having an army, but by reason of undertaking to put the world on fire. There are various ways of committing suicide; but if the country is dead, it is immaterial how it got there.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me just for a brief statement?

Mr. FLETCHER. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator from Tennessee has just stated that the Army proposed in the amendment carrying 150,000 enlisted men would be twice as large as the Army of the United States prior to the war.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON. No doubt the Senator will recall that under the national defense act passed in August, 1916, the Army, prior to our entering into the war, was augmented to 202,000 officers and men, or approximately that number, and that from the beginning to the end of the war those in charge of the Government were execrated by the people of this Nation for failing to provide for a sufficient Army, for a total disregard of what they termed necessary preparedness. Now, Mr. President, we are still technically in a state of war; and I respectfully suggest that especially those—I do not now refer to the Senator from Tennessee, but to other Senators who have participated in this debate—especially does it not lie in the mouths of those Senators who have opposed this Government entering into any relations for the preservation of the future peace of the world with other Governments to say that under the conditions as they now exist this Government ought not to have an Army of 175,000 men.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, of course, I am familiar with the Army reorganization act of 1916, in which the authority was given to raise an Army of some 225,000 men; but, as a matter of fact, it was by voluntary enlistment, and for the six years preceding the war, I would say, the Army on an average was very much nearer to 60,000 than 70,000, and it is now four times, or more than four times that number.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield to the Senator; but I will be through in just a moment.

Mr. OWEN. I merely wanted to make the observation that when the authority was given to increase the Army the world was then ablaze with war.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course.

Mr. OWEN. Moreover, with the destruction of the great military establishments of Europe the threat which hung over the world of a possible world war has been almost entirely removed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Absolutely.

Mr. OWEN. And the whole world is now trying to get back to a basis of disarmament in order to relieve the people of the world from the gigantic taxation which is consuming the taxpayers of the world. I am myself very much in favor of the smaller number.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think we ought to set an example to the world by going ahead and reducing our own Army.

Mr. ROBINSON. The Senator from Oklahoma has spoken just as if the world were at peace. He has referred to the fact that at the time the United States augmented its Army, in the manner and to the extent I spoke of a moment ago, the world was ablaze. I call his attention to the fact that the fire has not been extinguished yet. The United States has not yet made peace with her enemies, and war still continues along many battle fronts, bitter and desolating warfare. It is within the knowledge of every Senator present that the foreign relations of this Government respecting some of the great powers of the earth are, to say the least, not the most amicable that could be desired or that could be established.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I do not look for any war; I do not expect that we are going to have any conflict with any country in the world; but, at the same time, I am not in favor of doing away with the framework, the skeleton, if you please, of a standing Army. I know the Senator from Tennessee is not in favor of doing away with the Army, either. I merely stated a moment ago that his argument led to that sort of a conclusion. But I am not in favor of so crippling the Army as to make it ineffective, to make it worthless and useless in case there should be trouble. It would be unwise, it seems to me, to so limit the number of enlisted men in the Army that we could not carry on any training at all; that we could not keep up the necessary additions to the arms or branches which the World War has demonstrated we should have made, namely, the Chemical Warfare branch, the Air Service, and the Motor Transport Service, all of them calling for men in addition to those required in the Regular Army before this war. I am not in favor of abolishing those and preventing this work in connection with what may happen in the future in the air and under the sea. I say, it

would be folly for us to discontinue those branches of the Army.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator holds those views, he ought to oppose this bill entirely, for the reason that the best thought in the Army, of the leading officers of the Army, the Secretary of War, and all the important generals of the Army, who appeared before Congress last spring, was that the organization they proposed was the least organization, both of officers and men, consistent with the safety of the country. If the Senator thinks that 150,000 men will destroy it, by the same process of reasoning he must come to the conclusion that 175,000 will almost equally destroy it, and he should not vote for the joint resolution now. If I had the views about it the Senator has, I would certainly vote against the joint resolution.

Mr. FLETCHER. I understand, of course, about the testimony taken before the committee some months ago. But conditions have changed. Conditions are changing almost every day. It may be that six months from now I will vote to reduce the Army further. We can not foresee what may happen in that time. It may be that in six months from now we will vote to increase it, and the Senator from Tennessee will be ready to vote with us on that proposition.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will vote for it whenever it is necessary.

Mr. FLETCHER. But we do know now that conditions have changed since the Army reorganization bill was first submitted and hearings were had upon it. I was referring to these additional branches by way of comparing the 150,000, as proposed to be provided now, with the prewar number of about 103,000. That is about the comparison. If you add those I have mentioned, which we have seen fit to add, and will continue the Motor Transport Service, the Chemical Warfare Service, and the Air Service you will just about place the Army on the prewar footing. I think we ought to stand for that. I am therefore in favor of the joint resolution providing 175,000 enlisted men.

It may be material here to read in this connection a telegram which I have just received. Many of us have received similar telegrams, and this is a sample of the letters and telegrams which have come to me in this connection. The telegram is from Chicago, dated January 15, and is as follows:

In connection with newspaper publicity relative to proposed standing army, we ask that consideration be given to reports of Secretary of War Baker and Gen. Pershing, both stating that 200,000 is the minimum on which our Army can be successfully administered. We advocate nothing less than this figure.

THE CHICAGO ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE,
ARMY AND NAVY COMMITTEE,
CHARLES S. DEWEY, *Chairman*,
GEORGE M. SPANGLER, *Secretary*.

Mr. President, I am very anxious to have a conclusion reached regarding the joint resolution, and I shall not detain the Senate longer, although I might add something to what I have already said in support of the measure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the amendments made in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Assistant Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Beckham	Hale	McKellar	Sheppard
Borah	Harris	McLean	Simmons
Brandagee	Harrison	McNary	Smith, Ariz.
Calder	Hefflin	Moses	Smith, Ga.
Capper	Henderson	Myers	Smith, Md.
Cott	Hitchcock	Nelson	Smoot
Curtis	Johnson, Calif.	New	Spencer
Dial	Johnson, S. Dak.	Norris	Sterling
Dillingham	Jones, N. Mex.	Overman	Sutherland
Fall	Jones, Wash.	Owen	Swanson
Fernald	Kellogg	Page	Trammell
Fletcher	Kenyon	Phelan	Underwood
Frelinghuysen	Keyes	Pittman	Wadsworth
Gay	King	Poindexter	Walsh, Mass.
Gerry	Kirby	Pomerene	Walsh, Mont.
Glass	Knox	Ransdell	Warren
Gooding	La Follette	Reed	Williams
Gronna	McCumber	Robinson	Willis

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-two Senators have answered the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, when the notice for reconsideration was given by me last Friday, the Senate was not in possession of the information which had been given to the Committee on Military Affairs by Gen. Pershing and Secretary Baker, and the reconsideration was sought in order that the information given by the commanding general of the Army and the Secretary of War might be in the possession of the Senate before final action would be taken. I simply desire briefly to

state what that testimony was. The testimony in part was as follows:

Senator BECKHAM. I would like to ask Gen. Pershing, in line with Senator JOHNSON'S question, what he thinks of the proposed reduction of the Army to 150,000.

Gen. PERSHING. Well, I said in my reply to the Senator, I think, at this time it should not be reduced below 200,000. It seems to me it is getting on dangerous ground if we undertake to do too much at this time, with the world's affairs as they appear to be now.

Again, on page 13 of the testimony, Senator JOHNSON asked:

We would like, Gen. Pershing, to have your view about this temporary reduction.

Gen. PERSHING. It seems to me that at the moment there should be no very radical reduction made. I am of the opinion that conditions in the world do not warrant us in making too great a reduction. I should not like to see it reduced below 200,000 at the present time.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] said that 150,000 would represent about double the strength of the Army before the war. The chairman of the committee, Senator WADSWORTH, at that meeting, in answer to a suggestion of that kind said:

The reduction to 150,000 men should be considered in the light of the new obligations imposed upon the Army rather than in the light of the strength of the Regular Army of 1916.

That makes a very considerable difference. There should be at least 10,000 men in the Air Service. We authorized 16,000. There are 8,000 in the Philippine Scouts. There are 18,000 extra. There are 1,200 in the chemical-warfare department, which makes a total of 19,200. There are 1,800 in the Porto Rico regiment. That makes a total of over 21,000 men right there.

Secretary BAKER. And those were previously extra.

The CHAIRMAN. Previously they were not in the Regular Army.

Secretary of War Baker urged 250,000 men as a minimum.

So the war has brought new methods of warfare, chemical warfare and warfare growing out of the Air Service, and the Army of to-day, in the light of experiences of the war, of course, is not the same organization that it was before the war. In order to have the same strength in the Army, we must have numerically a greater Army to-day to be on a parity with our military strength before the war.

The high command, if I may so call it, of our Army, the respected General of the Army, in unequivocal terms, has stated that 200,000 would be the lowest number of enlisted men with which we might consider ourselves in the possession of a skeleton army with power to expand. If that is true, the Senate ought to be advised of it.

Some one wrote a book not a long time ago called "The Valor of Ignorance," a very illuminating title. I think it might bear critically upon Members of this body who, without any familiarity with war or the organization of an army, certainly not in the field, have ventured to express views diametrically opposed to the view of our respected commander of the Army, whose opinion certainly is entitled to the greatest weight. In that book, *The Valor of Ignorance*, which conveyed the idea that we are valorous because we do not know the danger, it was clearly pointed out that we required an army because there was danger.

The writer of that book—an American—was a general in the Chinese Army, and had his collegiate training at Leland Stanford Junior University. He was a man of action and a man of letters, and he clearly foresaw all the dangers into which this country was about to be precipitated. He knew the necessity of having an adequate defense. In the book he gives information which leads us to believe, coming from him as a distinguished strategist, that there would be no difficulty in landing an army upon the American coast, notwithstanding the assertions here to-day that it would be impossible to make a landing upon the Pacific coast of America. If it is at all possible to land upon the Pacific coast of America, we must not only have a navy as a first line of defense, but we must have a garrisoned coast, where we have an adequate number of men to man our shore batteries.

We are not in a position to-day to take advantage of the opportunities we possess for the public defense of Alaska, the Canal Zone, Guam, the islands of the Caribbean. In the island of Hawaii there is an inadequate garrison. During the war we had to strip the Hawaiian Island garrison and substitute a national guard composed one-half of Japanese. The island of Guam requires a garrison, more so to-day since the Japanese have taken possession of the Mariana, Marshall, and Caroline Islands surrounding Guam, which has destroyed it in the eyes of military men as a strategical point for the United States and brought Japan 2,000 miles closer to our shore. Japan has fortified a great island nearer her coast which our ships are not permitted to approach, a veritable Gibraltar.

When it is stated that there is no danger in the Pacific which would justify adequate preparedness, I will call the attention of the Senate to the fact that it has developed that at this very moment there is a controversy, involving considerable danger,

between the powers of Europe and Asia on the one hand and the United States on the other, with respect to the island of Yap, vitally necessary for our communication with the Far East and which we were promised in the conference at Versailles, according to the President. If that is vital for our communication, perhaps it will be necessary for us to insist upon the redemption of the promise made to the President of the United States by the Japanese at that time. At any rate, whatever may happen, it will persevere and cause friction.

I am not speaking of the California situation to-day, because it is a long story, although the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], I believe, belittled the danger which arises from the presence of Japanese in California. I need only to direct your attention to the fact that within a week the Legislature of the State of California, both in the senate and in the assembly, by a unanimous vote informed the Federal Government that should it interfere, by treaty or otherwise, in invalidating the alien land law of California barring oriental aliens from the soil, or if it endeavored to confer citizenship upon orientals resident in California a situation would be created which, I am sure, would be both painful and disagreeable for the country at large.

The memorial itself is on the way and will be published in the Record in a few days and will speak for itself.

I do not know what recourse California would have should her vital interests be sacrificed to the maintaining of a so-called "friendship" with a country that is disputing every foot of ground in the Pacific; with a country that holds no friendly feeling toward the United States, which it regards as an aggressor.

I call attention to this Associated Press dispatch from Tokyo: JAPAN EXPECTS UNITED STATES TREATY TO KILL LAND LAW—TOKYO DIET TOLD CALIFORNIA MEASURE WILL BE NULLIFIED.

[By the Associated Press.]

TOKYO, December 24, 1920.

Addressing preliminary meetings of the diet here to-day, Viscount Uchida, the foreign minister, expressed the opinion that a new Japanese-American treaty will be concluded, leading to nullification of the California land law. He said he expected such action to result from the negotiations which have been in progress at Washington between Ambassador Morris and the Japanese ambassador.

Ambassadors, he said, were making efforts to obtain an understanding with the Senate to obtain passage of the treaty, but if the negotiations fail a formal protest would be lodged.

Answering interpellations, M. Uchida said the negotiations were proceeding on the understanding that such a treaty would override the State laws.

Texas the other day received only two families of Japanese who had acquired land and who were about to settle in the Rio Grande Valley. What happened? This is significant. It was not a vigilance committee that waited upon the Japanese. It was a great law-abiding and law-enforcing body of men, none less than representatives of the American Legion. In their two conventions at Minneapolis and at Cleveland, nation wide, the American Legion resolved that the Japanese question must be settled upon the lines demanded by California, and that great organization of fighting men is behind the cause advocating the exclusion of the Japanese, barring them from the ownership of the soil and the enjoyment of the voting privilege. I was rejoiced to see it, because the Congress, while it might, which I sincerely doubt, ignore the petition of California, a State afflicted and most familiar with the subject, would not ignore the petition of that great body of patriotic Americans who established the prestige of United States arms in the World War.

We must bear in mind, therefore, that this is as much an American question as it is a California question, and if there is any danger in that situation it is idle for Senators to say we are in a time of profound peace. War is going on all over the world. Gen. Pershing knows that. He knew our inadequate Army before he was sent into Mexico with an insufficient force which made our service ridiculous and brought discredit upon our country by failing to make an effective strike.

I am told that with a knowledge of that expedition to Mexico, the very peons of Mexico look upon us with a great deal of contempt. If we ever entered Mexico, we should have finally established the purposes for which we entered Mexico, but we have gone on in a policy of vacillation; our councils have been pacific; but the nations of the world have imposed on our pacifism, and the only way to win their respect, I believe, is to have a strong Army and a strong Navy until the dangers are passed, not to strike but to be ready to strike.

The times are out of joint. The world is really at war to-day, and there are potentialities in the immediate future which are alarming. That has been indicated by discussion in the Committee on Foreign Relations, in the Committees on Naval and Military Affairs, and in the press. There is no peace in the world to-day, and the United States technically is still at war.

In view of these circumstances, I lay great stress upon the testimony of Gen. Pershing. I think it would be a mistake to weaken our Army organization. As the chairman of the Com-

mittee on Military Affairs may possibly tell the Senate, we have an organization of an Army on the basis of 240,000 enlisted men, and if we cut it down to 175,000 it will make the task difficult, but far more difficult if we cut it down to 150,000. So, in order to maintain an organization that is worthy of the name, upon which a greater organization, if necessary, may be built, it seems to me extremely desirable that the recommendations of the committee be adopted by the Senate establishing the Army strength at 175,000 enlisted men.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have listened, as everybody always does listen, with a great deal of intensive interest to the utterances of the Senator from California. It is not always given to all of us to regard his conclusions with any degree of tolerable respect, but it is always given to us to regard his earnestness and his zeal for the Pacific slope with that degree of respect which a sectional man, as I am, regards a sectional effort of another man, such as he is.

The Senator tells us that the Legislature of California has just "given notice" that it will defy any treaties of the United States that do this, that, or the other thing; and he tells us that it would be an awfully "disagreeable thing" if an impasse came between the Legislature of California and the United States Government. My memory goes back—historically, not individually—to a period when 11 different Southern States read riot acts like that to the Federal Government, and the result was, as predicted, very disagreeable, very, indeed.

The State of the Senator from California is not really proposing a new secession or a new nullification, or a new war against the Union. But if he did not mean that, he did not mean much of anything; he was simply "vaporizing in the air." Our people, when we said that we meant all that, really did mean it and we intended to fight. We did fight, we fought for four years, and we died, a whole lot of us—not myself amongst them, but some of us, you understand, amongst our ancestors.

The Senator does not mean a word of that. California is not going to declare war against the Union. She is not going to nullify anything. She is not going to secede. She is not going to nullify any treaty. She is not going to defy any laws of the United States. She has not the slightest idea of doing it to-day, and the Senator knows it. But he bases his entire argument in favor of the possibility of war between Japan and the United States upon the action of the Legislature of California and the possible counteraction of Japan. He knows the Government of the United States is not going to be bulldozed by the Legislature of California—I will not say bulldozed; I mean influenced. It will not be influenced in the slightest degree. It might have been under a Democratic administration and with the weakness of Democracy, but it can not be under the plutocratic administration which is just coming in with the strength of plutocracy that insists that everything should be surrendered to money. Even at the beginning of the Civil War if plutocracy had been in command, we never would have had any war. They would have said, Let us trade together and let us have peace.

The Senator from California tells us in the next place that there is "war all over the world." Yes, everywhere except in the United States and everywhere except between the United States and another party. Why does the Senator want to say "there is war all over the world" as an inducement for us to build up a great big Army to keep off enemies? Where are the enemies? I ask the Senator from California now to rise in his place and tell me where are the enemies.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi, of course, means enemies of the United States. It is very hard to declare as enemies people who, in the language of diplomacy, are on friendly terms with the United States. I do not believe that the Japanese Government is, in a true sense, friendly to the interests of the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Nor do I.

Mr. PHELAN. I know that she resents the attitude of the United States on the subject of racial inequality, and I can understand the Japanese position. She simply says, "We are a world power, and our nationals are entitled to as much consideration as are the nationals of any other country." That, if acceded to, would bear very hard upon the Pacific coast, because, as in the case of the Hawaiian Islands, the Pacific coast would soon pass to the political and actual control of orientals. If we conferred citizenship upon those who reside there, it would simply speed that day.

So there is a real situation there. However, I did not say, as the Senator from Mississippi has repeated—and I think he is mistaken—that the Legislature of California has defied the Federal Government. There is no note of defiance, but I referred to a memorial adopted by a sovereign State.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not yield to the Senator from California to make a speech. I yielded to him to answer a question,

Mr. PHELAN. Then, I will answer the question in one word more. I would say that we are also on terms of amity and peace with the Republic of Mexico, but they are passing laws which are prejudicial to our nationals there, and there was an incipient revolution there the other day. There is a constant menace to us upon the Mexican border. It is easy to recall the raid at Columbus.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I asked the Senator from California to point out a possible enemy of the United States, meaning by it, as you must have understood and as every Member of the Senate must have understood, any power anywhere that had the will to attack, had the power to attack, and would attack the United States. The Senator has failed to answer the question. He knows as well as I do that Japan neither dares nor will attack the United States because of any legislation which may be passed in California.

Mr. PHELAN. Russia once thought so.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Oh, well, never mind about that. I was not going off on side issues of one description or another.

The Senator from California tells us that the peons of Mexico despise us. Is not that awful? Just think of it! The peons of Mexico despise the American Republic because we have not properly asserted our dignity; because we have not gone down and spanked a lot of little children who are playing around in the back yard and are shooting bows and arrows at us and spitting fire at us now and then, chewing gum and squirting out of their upper lips at us. Is not that awful? The peons of Mexico despise us! Let us raise an immense, great big Army because the peons of Mexico despise us!

What would happen to the peons of Mexico if we should let loose the State of Texas on her without any of the other States of the Union at all? Mexican statesmen have said they could whip the United States if we would keep Texas off her. If we should turn Texas, Arizona, and New Mexico, all three of them, at any time onto Mexico, we should never hear another word of the peons of Mexico.

Oh, my friend, the Senator from California, does not mean that sort of stuff; he really does not mean it. He thinks he means it now and then when he is talking freely, but he really does not mean that because the peon of Mexico despises the United States we should have an Army of 175,000 instead of an Army of 150,000 men; or because now and then a Negro in South Carolina despises a white man that the white man should go around all the time with a howitzer, a mountain pistol, and a rifle. He does not mean that. I have more respect for his intelligence than to think so.

Mr. President, I have been waiting all day to hear the testimony of Gen. Pershing. From the way Senators were talking about it I thought it must be awful, but when I came to hear it, it is this, as quoted by the Senator from California:

It seems to me we are getting on dangerous ground.

That is Pershing's utterance. Is not that an oracular sort of a thing? It sounds like the oracle of Delphi when the ambassadors from the Greek Republic came before it. Later on Gen. Pershing says:

It seems to me that at this moment no radical reduction should be made.

What that means I can not tell; what it means the Senator from California can not tell, or at least does not explain. I do not know what a "radical reduction" means; I do not know what "reduction" means. Reduction from what and to what and when? It means absolutely nothing. Of all the miraculous, oracular, indefinite, vague things I have ever heard, it is the most miraculous, oracular, indefinite, and vague. I do not think Gen. Pershing can have been accurately quoted. He must have said something more definite than that. Did Gen. Pershing tell us what he thinks the strength of the United States Army ought to be? I think the Senator from California said that Gen. Pershing said it ought to be 200,000 men. Is that correct?

Mr. PHELAN. Yes. The Senator from Mississippi has his testimony there. Gen. Pershing said the minimum number should be 200,000; the Secretary said 250,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then, Mr. President, Gen. Pershing's testimony goes for naught, because Gen. Pershing stated that the strength of the United States Army, as the least possible skeleton around which to build flesh and muscle and blood, should be 200,000. Already the committee has reduced it by 25,000, and now all we wish to do is to reduce it by another 25,000.

Pershing is as badly off with the skeleton, even if he could keep all the bones, with a reduction of 25,000 men, as he would be with a reduction of 50,000. I believe the Senator from California is a member of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PHELAN. No.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But the Senator is defending the report of the committee; the committee has come in with a report pro-

posing to maim and cripple Pershing's estimate by 25,000 men; the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] comes in with a proposition to maim and cripple him by 25,000 more; and the Senator from California is supporting the 25,000 maim and cripple proposition, but is not supporting the other 25,000. What is the difference? If the skeleton will not fit by 25,000, it is not much worse off if it does not fit by 50,000.

Mr. PHELAN. It is a misfit.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; the Senator is supporting an absolute misfit of 25,000.

"A skeleton Army with power to expand." My God! expand to what? The funny thing about this debate is that nobody tells us to what this skeleton is going to expand; and yet they dwell with absolute literalness—and the Scripture says the letter kills while the spirit saves—on the skeleton as a prerequisite to the expansion, but never tell us what the expansion is. I defy the Senator from California right now to tell me in figures what the expansion is of men, officers, and various branches of artillery, infantry, and so forth.

Mr. PHELAN. That is to be determined by the necessity which may arise.

Mr. WILLIAMS. "Now, I have you on the hip," as Gratiano said to Shylock. "To be determined by necessity"—the skeleton to accord with the necessity, and the necessity to be determined by the necessity. Therefore there must be à la Pershing absolutely an Army of 200,000; à la the committee exactly 175,000; à la LENROOT exactly 150,000; à moi probably 100,000. The Senator tells me that the maximum up to which the skeleton is to be built is to be fixed by "necessity." Well, why not build the skeleton by necessity then, and why not consider the present moment as a part of the necessity?

Now, as a citizen of America, of whom are you afraid? Who is going to attack you in the immediate or in the remote future, so far as you know? Of whom are you scared? Why, Mr. President, the funniest thing about this is that this debate begins with a Yap and as far as the Senator from California is concerned it almost concludes in a yap, because he tells us that if we do not carry out this thing far enough we may probably lost Yap. Three-fourths of the Senate right now do not know where Yap is; nine-tenths of the Senate, including the Senator from California, and certainly including myself, never heard of Yap until the Versailles treaty was concluded, when we found out that Yap was an island somewhere in the Pacific. So we are going to yap for a big Army; we are going to yap against the Japanese; we are going to yap between a reduction of 25,000 and 50,000 in the Army, in order that we may have an opportunity to yap forever. I doubt if the Senator from California can tell me right now, by longitude and latitude, or even if the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], the best informed man in this body upon military affairs, can tell me by longitude and latitude where Yap is.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I presume my judgment of latitude and longitude is much like that of the Senator from Mississippi—somewhat mixed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if the judgment of the Senator from Wyoming as to the latitude of Yap is like mine, it is the most vague and indefinite judgment that he could possibly describe. I positively do not know anything about Yap, and do not care anything about it, and I would not give a continental cent to-morrow for the difference between the United States having it and China having it and Japan having it and Great Britain having it and France having it and Germany having it, or even poor little Austria having it.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, the Senator asks me concerning the location of Yap. It is sufficient to know that it lies between our Philippine possessions and our possessions at Guam. But when the Senator says that two-thirds of the Senate have not heard about the Island of Yap, I desire to say that the Naval Affairs Committee was informed confidentially by the naval authorities that it was vital to our communications. That was stated in a document that was held confidential. It is not new. I knew it at that time. The Senator from Mississippi, not being a member of the committee, was not informed, and for that I am sorry. I recall a rhyme that—

The latitude is rather uncertain,
And the longitude is equally vague,
But that person I pity who knows not the city—
The beautiful city of Prague.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I differ with the Senator from California about one thing. He rather regrets that I do not know, or did not know at some time, where Yap was. I am rather proud of the fact that I have not encumbered my intellect with any knowledge concerning Yap. A fellow has a good deal to learn in this world, and he ought to learn to conserve his intellect, and one of the best things that he can

do is to disregard Yap and all other nonessentials at the beginning; but there is some lesson in this.

This debate begins in favor of an Army of 175,000 against an Army of 150,000 in a yap, and concludes in a yap. That is about all there is to it.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, one word. I desire a vote as much as anyone, and I want to thank the Senator for having brought up the question of the protest of California, which I deny was a defiance.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I never said that it was a defiance.

Mr. PHELAN. The Senator said that the Southern States also made a protest, but finally had to resort to arms. Our very purpose in California is to make a protest at this time to prevent the Japanese becoming a race question, which may involve war, just as the importation of slaves in the early days of the Republic ultimately led to war. We are taking this precaution in time, and I am very glad that the Senator reminds me of that struggle.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the South also for 10 or 15 years prior to the Civil War again and again took State action of one sort or another and convention action of one sort or another, and always coupled it with the protestation, which was absolutely sincere, that its object was not to bring about a war, but to prevent war.

Mr. PHELAN. But you made no attempt to get rid of the Negroes. We want to eliminate the provocation in time and rid the State of the Japanese.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Ah! Mr. President, that reminds me of another thing that occurred on this floor some time ago. But, to go on with this thought, we also protested all the time that we were trying to preserve and not to destroy the Union, and we were trying to do it; but we finally got to a point which was a point of impasse, where we had to fight, and the other side had to fight, and then when that came we fought; and, by the way, we did not fight behind hedges. We did not fight hiddenly. We fought as brave men—not I; I mean my ancestors. I did not fight. I never fought anything much; but we did it.

"Ah," then the Senator says, "but you made no proposition to get rid of the Negroes."

I suppose he means to get rid of slavery—of course, we could not get rid of the Negroes without killing them. That reminds me that in a previous debate upon this floor the Senator said something which I did not at that time hear. I have much wherewith to charge my deaf ears. I wish that I had heard it. It was when he exclaimed, in highly dramatic tones, "Ireland fights for liberty and the South fought for slavery!"

Mr. President, if the Senator from California were right about that, then the greatest man upon the northern side, Abraham Lincoln, and the greatest man upon the southern side, Robert E. Lee, were liars, and the Senator from California is the only man who knows what the sections fought about. Abraham Lincoln, in his first inaugural, just before the war broke out, professed upon the east portico of this Capitol, right out here, in substance: "I do not pretend that we have the constitutional right or the power to interfere with slavery wherever it exists, nor are we fighting for that." I am not quoting him accurately. The Senator ought to remember what he said, in spirit. And Robert E. Lee, later on, said: "I would set every Negro that I have free to-morrow rather than have this trouble." But after Abraham Lincoln said that we were not fighting about slavery, but were fighting, from his standpoint, to maintain the Union, and after Robert E. Lee—noble descendant of thousands of English ancestry, all noble in their way—said that he was not fighting to maintain slavery, but was fighting for the right of self-determination, the right of a community to adopt and maintain its own government, which seems to be a right sacred right now in Ireland across the ocean; then steps into the arena the great Senator from California, and pronounces Abraham Lincoln and Robert E. Lee both liars, while he himself becomes the infallible pope of the history of the war between the States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is clearly out of order if the rules of the Senate are to be obeyed.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Question!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Would it be possible to decide upon concurrence in these amendments en bloc, or should it be done one by one?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There was no reservation in Committee of the Whole for a separate vote in the Senate. There is just one of two things that can be done. One is not to concur in these amendments, and then submit other amendments to the Senate; or the action can be taken back, the vote whereby

the joint resolution passed to the Senate can be reconsidered, and the bill can go back to the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think, if it is agreeable to the Senate, it would be quicker to take a vote on concurrence in all the amendments at once. If that motion to concur, which is the pending motion, fails, then the bill is open to amendment, still being in the Senate; and in that event I should offer an amendment correcting the bill so that 62½ per cent of the various branches may be substituted for 53½ per cent, and the amendments reported from the committee to which there was no objection might also be included.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I desire a separate vote on the question of the size of the Army, because I have no objection to the other amendments, and I would not care to vote against them. In fact, I think they ought to go in; but I want a separate vote upon the number, because we can not vote intelligently in any other way.

Mr. WADSWORTH. But the Vice President has informed me that a separate vote was not reserved for any of the amendments in the Senate.

Mr. SWANSON. It is not necessary to reserve it. It comes up as a new proposition in the Senate. When there is a close yea-and-nay vote, as in Committee of the Whole, it is customary to reserve a question so that there is an excuse for not taking the vote on concurrence en bloc. This is a reconsideration of the vote concurring in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BORAH. I should assume that the question would be as to whether or not we would concur in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes; and the Chair is ruling that as the record now stands there can be but one vote upon that question, there having been no reservation of a separate vote upon any particular amendment in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It really makes no difference so far as the result is concerned, I will say to the Senator from Idaho. Those who desire an Army of 175,000 will vote against concurring in all the amendments. Those who want an Army of 150,000 will vote to concur in the amendments. If those favoring an Army of 175,000 prevail, then all the amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole will be stricken from the bill, whereupon I shall endeavor to secure the floor and offer amendments to perfect the bill as it came from the committee on the basis of 175,000.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, as I understand, this amendment came from Committee of the Whole fixing the number at 150,000, did it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There are other amendments besides that.

Mr. SWANSON. There are other amendments, but I say the amendment came from the Committee of the Whole fixing the number at 150,000, not 175,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Exactly.

Mr. SWANSON. Then, what is the pending question—that all these amendments, including the number of 150,000, be voted upon?

The VICE PRESIDENT. To be sure.

Mr. SWANSON. There is no amendment pending for 175,000 at all, then, is there?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Of course not. If they are concurred in, the status is fixed at 150,000. If they are not concurred in, the body of the act remains at 175,000.

Mr. SWANSON. As I understand, there is a general rule to the effect that where a proposition contains different propositions a separate vote can be asked for; but I have never seen anything in the rules or in the precedents saying that it must be reserved. It is generally reserved as a matter of precaution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is going to stick to his ruling, however, until the Senate overrules him.

Mr. SWANSON. The Chair usually does when he makes one.

Mr. BORAH. Especially if he is right.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is right in that, too.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, as I understand, those who should vote "yea" on the question as to concurring in the amendments would be voting for 150,000?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Exactly.

Mr. BORAH. And those who should vote "nay" would vote so that they could afterwards have an opportunity to vote for 175,000.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, it seems to me, if the Senator will permit me, that if this joint resolution should go into the Committee of the Whole, then the motion to go into the Senate could be preceded by a request to reserve these two amendments for a separate vote. If that is done, we will get a direct vote on those two amendments, because everybody, as I

understand, concurs in the general amendments to the bill except this one fixing the number at 175,000 and the one in regard to the 62½ per cent, which must be changed if we change the number of men.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Question!

Mr. DIAL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I hope the Senator will withdraw that suggestion. I think there is a quorum present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. We had one just a moment ago.

Mr. BORAH. They are not here now.

Mr. DIAL. I withdraw the suggestion, Mr. President.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The yeas and nays will determine it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks nothing has been done since the last quorum call.

Mr. WADSWORTH. No business has transpired.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair, then, will not entertain the motion.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, would it not be possible, by unanimous consent, to vote separately on the question mentioned by the Senator from Idaho?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senate so desires, there is no reason in the world why it should not, by unanimous consent, send the joint resolution back to the Committee of the Whole and vote on each of these amendments. The Senate can send the joint resolution back to the Committee of the Whole, set aside all the votes on all the amendments, and then proceed to vote on the amendments.

There is no reason why it can not be done. Is there any objection?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I do not want to object, but it seems to me that the thing we should do is to vote in the regular way on whether or not the amendments of the Committee of the Whole shall be approved. If it should develop that they are approved, that would approve the 150,000 amendment and also all the others. It would end it. If it should develop that the motion is defeated, then, all the committee amendments are defeated, and the joint resolution is subject to amendment in the Senate; and there would not be any objection—I suppose it could be done by unanimous consent—to having the Senator immediately offer his amendment and that would end it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is the plan I proposed.

Mr. NORRIS. As I understand, then, the vote now is on this question: Shall the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole be concurred in by the Senate?

If the Senator from Michigan will give us his attention for just a moment, suppose, as he says, that that question is decided in the negative; then the bill is still in the Senate and open to amendment, and the Senator from New York can offer his amendment, and it will go through, as a matter of course.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Under those circumstances, would a committee amendment, after having been defeated in the Senate, be subject to be offered again in the Senate?

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to say to the Senator that it has not been defeated separately. If the motion is decided in the negative, the amendments are all defeated, en bloc.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Can any one of them be offered again in the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has not any doubt about that. Of course, they can be offered in the Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. I ask for the yeas and nays on concurring in the amendments.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is going to state the question as the record stands now. The question is, Will the Senate concur in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole? The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL]. He is absent, but I understand he would vote as I shall, and, being at liberty to vote, I vote "nay."

Mr. HENDERSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK]. In his absence I transfer my pair to the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] and vote "nay."

Mr. KNOX (when his name was called). I am informed that my pair, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], would vote as I propose to vote, in the negative. Therefore I am at liberty to vote, and vote "nay."

Mr. POMERENE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS]. I do not know how he would vote upon this subject. I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (when the name of Mr. SMITH of South Carolina was called). The senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] asked me to announce that he is compelled to be absent on account of important business, and that he is paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. STERLING]. I ask that the announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. NEW (when Mr. WATSON's name was called). I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. WATSON] on account of illness. He is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT]. If here and permitted to vote, my colleague would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. FALL. I have a pair with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. SHERMAN (after having voted in the negative). I understand the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] has not voted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have with him a general pair. I transfer my pair to the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. OWEN. I transfer my pair with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] to the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and vote "yea."

Mr. McCUMBER. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS]. Not knowing what his vote would be upon this question, I withhold my vote.

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS];

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT]; and

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. STERLING] with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. GERRY. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] on account of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 41, as follows:

YEAS—33.

Borah	Jones, N. Mex.	Owen	Swanson
Capper	Jones, Wash.	Pittman	Trammell
Dial	Kenyon	Reed	Underwood
Gerry	King	Sheppard	Walsh, Mass.
Gore	La Follette	Simmons	Walsh, Mont.
Gronna	McKellar	Smith, Ariz.	Williams
Harrison	McNary	Smith, Md.	
Heflin	Norris	Smoot	
Johnson, S. Dak.	Overman	Stanley	

NAYS—41.

Ashurst	Gay	McLean	Sherman
Beckham	Gooding	Moses	Smith, Ga.
Brandeggee	Hale	Myers	Spencer
Calder	Harris	Nelson	Sutherland
Colt	Henderson	New	Townsend
Curtis	Hitchcock	Penrose	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Johnson, Calif.	Phelan	Warren
Fall	Kellogg	Phipps	Willis
Fernald	Keyes	Poindexter	
Fletcher	Kirby	Ransdell	
Frelinghuysen	Knox	Robinson	

NOT VOTING—22.

Ball	France	McCumber	Sterling
Chamberlain	Glass	Newberry	Thomas
Culbertson	Kendrick	Page	Watson
Cummins	Lenroot	Pomerene	Wolcott
Edge	Lodge	Shields	
Elkins	McCormick	Smith, S. C.	

So the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole were nonconcurrent in.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I offer a number of amendments, indicated upon the copy of the joint resolution, which I send to the desk and I ask that they may be acted upon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendments in their order.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. Offered on behalf of the Committee on Military Affairs:

On page 2, line 4, strike out the words "and instructed"; at the end of line 4, after the words "Regular Army," insert "except reenlistments of men who at the time of the passage of this act have served more than one year in the Regular Army or the Army of the United States during the recent emergency," and a comma; on line 10, after the words "pay of," insert the words "more than 175,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. After the word "Congress" and the period at the end of line 11, insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, however, That during the period in which the Army is being reduced to such enlisted strength sufficient enlistments may be made in any branch of the Army to bring such branch to not more

than 62½ per cent of the number prescribed therefor in the act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes,' approved June 3, 1916, and to establish military justice," approved June 4, 1920.

The amendment was agreed to.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. Insert a new section in the joint resolution, as follows:

SEC. 2. That until the enlisted strength of the Army is reduced to 175,000 men the Secretary of War is authorized in his discretion to grant applications for discharge of enlisted men who have served one year or more with records satisfactory to their commanding officers without regard to the provisions of existing law respecting discharges.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senate reconsiders the vote whereby it amended the preamble and the title of the bill, and the preamble and title will stand as reported from the committee.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15130) making appropriations for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, and for other purposes.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 18, 1921, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Monday, January 17, 1921.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Rev. John H. Jeffries, D. D., of the Ryland Methodist Episcopal Church, of Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Let the words of our mouth and the meditations of our heart be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, our strength and our redeemer. Command Thy blessing to rest upon Thy servants here to conserve the best interests of the Nation. May they walk in the consciousness of divine direction. May the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, rest upon us this morning and upon this Nation, and may all that shall be said and done be to the honor and glory of God. We ask it in the name of our common Lord and Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, January 15, 1921, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message in writing from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had, on January 13, 1921, approved and signed the bill of the following title:

H. R. 12337. An act to provide for the relief of Anthony Sulik, former sergeant, United States Marine Corps.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT CALENDAR.

The SPEAKER. This is suspension day, and the Clerk will call the Calendar for Unanimous Consent.

COURTHOUSE AND JAIL AT CORDOVA, ALASKA.

The first business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 12437) to authorize the expenditure of the sum of \$100,000 heretofore appropriated for the erection of a United States post office, courthouse, and jail at Cordova, Alaska, by the act approved March 4, 1913, for the erection of a United States courthouse and jail at Cordova, Alaska.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the bill is one which I have no doubt is peculiarly within the information of the Delegate from Alaska, and I have reserved the right to object in order that he may explain the circumstances and the necessity for the appropriation.

Mr. LANGLEY. I suggest that the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. GRIGSBY] explain the bill.

Mr. GRIGSBY. Mr. Speaker, the bill is one to make available for the construction of a courthouse and jail, the sum of \$100,000, which was appropriated in 1913 to construct a courthouse and jail and post office. The sum was found to be insufficient for that kind of a building. The Supervising Architect, however, reported that he could construct the courthouse and

jail with that amount. This bill makes available that sum for that purpose. There is no additional appropriation. It is simply making available an original appropriation.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GRIGSBY. I yield.

Mr. SNELL. I did not understand. What was the original appropriation?

Mr. GRIGSBY. One hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. SNELL. And is this for an additional appropriation?

Mr. GRIGSBY. No; it is not. It is to make available the same amount of money for a building which can be constructed.

Mr. SNELL. They are going to erect a new type of building that can be constructed for the \$100,000?

Mr. GRIGSBY. For the same money, and dispense with the post-office part of the building.

Mr. SNELL. What will be the proposition in future years for a post office? Will they have to have another building for that later on?

Mr. GRIGSBY. The Government has not appropriated any money for post offices in Alaska up to date. They rent post-office buildings all over the Territory, and probably will continue to do so.

Mr. LANGLEY. The committee reported this bill because it asked for no additional appropriation, but merely a modification of the original plans to come within the limits of the appropriation already made.

Mr. SNELL. The thought I had in mind was, if they would come back for an additional appropriation for a post office.

Mr. LANGLEY. It does not look now as if anybody will have a chance to "come back" on that score at an early date.

Mr. SNELL. I think it is a proper thing to know whether, as soon as that is done, there will be a request for an additional sum for a post office.

Mr. LANGLEY. The gentleman from Alaska [Mr. GRIGSBY] can answer that question. The committee does not know what the purpose is in that regard, but will, of course, consider any proposition presented at the proper time, just as they will any other proposition.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman from Alaska yield?

Mr. GRIGSBY. I will.

Mr. MONDELL. There are a great many cases in which the appropriations for public buildings are inadequate for the construction of the buildings as planned at this time. There are, as I recollect it, upward of 100, perhaps 150, such cases in the country.

Mr. LANGLEY. One hundred and sixteen, I think, that are classed as "emergency cases" by the department, although there are many more than that that are really emergent.

Mr. MONDELL. One hundred and sixteen, the gentleman says. We are making no provision for the 116, although some of the buildings are badly needed. I take it for granted that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, when it reported this bill, reported it because of some extraordinary emergency existing in Cordova. Is that true? If there is no extraordinary condition existing at Cordova over and above and beyond the conditions existing elsewhere throughout the country, then there is no justification for a bill of this kind, and it seems to me the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY], the chairman of the committee, ought to be able to inform the House whether or not there is some extraordinary condition of urgency at Cordova over and above and beyond that existing elsewhere which justified the reporting of a bill for Cordova which accomplishes, by the elimination of one use, the erection of a building which could not otherwise be erected without an increase of the limit of cost.

Mr. LANGLEY. I will state to the gentleman that the distinction between this and the other class of cases is that this does not involve an additional appropriation, while the other propositions would involve it, and I will say further that I did not happen to be in the city when the hearing was had and the report prepared, and am not, therefore, as familiar with the facts as I would otherwise be.

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman will yield?

Mr. LANGLEY. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. It does involve an additional appropriation.

Mr. SNELL. Because we are doing only a part of the work.

Mr. MONDELL (continuing). Because you are eliminating one of the purposes for which the building is to be used, evidently with the idea of providing for a post office later. So that this bill does in effect involve an increase just as much as though it had increased the limit of cost in the bill.

Mr. LANGLEY. Now, the gentleman from Alaska can perhaps explain what the purpose is in that regard, and I suggest that he enlighten the gentleman and the House.

Mr. SNELL. Before that, may I ask the gentleman from Kentucky another question?

Mr. LANGLEY. Certainly.

Mr. SNELL. It seems to me that until we adopt a general policy to take care of these emergency propositions we ought not to pick out one particular place and pass an appropriation for it at this time. I have a post office in my district that has been an emergency proposition for 10 years, and it has been so described by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General. They assort the mail on the sidewalk. So I believe that until we make a general proposition to take care of all these post offices we ought not to pass a special one at this time.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. GRIGSBY], who can explain the necessities in this case.

Mr. GRIGSBY. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman that it is probable that when this courthouse is constructed that the seat of the court of the third division of Alaska will be removed to Cordova. The seat of the court is now at Valdez. It is eight hours by boat from Cordova. At every term of court there are hundreds of witnesses and jurors and prisoners transported to Valdez at an enormous expense. This will be a great saving to the Government. The seat may be transferred to Cordova as soon as the building is completed. It is an emergency case. I do not think there is any doubt about that.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIGSBY. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that this \$100,000 has already been authorized and appropriated.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question right there?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Let me finish this statement. Then I will yield and endeavor to answer all questions you may want to ask, if I have time. This \$100,000 has been authorized and appropriated for the specific purpose of constructing a building to take care of the court, the jail, and the post office. The money is not sufficient for that purpose. They need the courthouse and the jail worse than they do the other. So it has been thought advisable to do this, so long as it took no additional money, and this particular amount has already been appropriated. The Treasury officials say they can construct the jail and the courthouse within the limit of cost, and therefore the committee reported the bill, simply eliminating the post office in order to allow the jail and the courthouse to be constructed, which are so badly needed by these people in Alaska.

There will not be a dollar saved by objecting to the passage of this bill. On the contrary, it is going to entail thousands of dollars of cost in bringing these witnesses and jurors back and forth, as stated by the gentleman from Alaska.

Now, let me say this, further: Gentlemen have raised the question of these buildings that are needed. As the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY] said, every one of them requires an additional authorization, and we have been informed that no bill of that character will be permitted to pass. Therefore the committee, bowing to that rule or order, or whatever you may term it, has not reported any of those bills. I believe that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds will agree, if they get any intimation from this House that it will pass it, to report a bill in here that will take care of every one of these emergency cases that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] refers to. But in his case it will require an additional appropriation of money out of the Treasury. If the House wants us to do that, we are perfectly willing to do it.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. It seems to me you are doing the same thing as asking for an additional appropriation, because you are doing only one-half or two-thirds of what was contemplated. You are asking for only two-thirds.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Not at all.

Mr. SNELL. But, after all, the money comes out of the Treasury, and it does not seem to me we should pick out one case unless we are in a position to deal with all of them.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. It takes \$100,000 now to build the courthouse and jail. That is what the authorities tell us. To add a provision for a post office might take \$50,000 or \$100,000 more; I do not know.

Mr. SNELL. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. You have got to appropriate that extra money, possibly \$50,000, now or some time hereafter. Why not construct the building when you can save thousands of dollars to the Government in transportation of these witnesses and jurors and prisoners, when the money is already appropri-

ated and available? Does the gentleman propose to say that because it has been considered by those in authority in the House that you will not make these appropriations, therefore you are going to mulct the Government in thousands of dollars in needless expenses because a jail and a courthouse are to be built somewhere, and you do not get a post office?

Mr. SNELL. I am not asking for any post office at the present time, and I think I have been as considerate in asking for appropriations as anyone else in the House. I have really earnestly tried to cut down appropriations at this time, and until there has been some general policy adopted to deal with these emergency propositions I am constrained to object to this measure, and I do object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York objects. The Clerk will report the next bill.

ALLOTMENTS ON FORT BELKNAP RESERVATION, MONT.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 13225) providing for the allotment of lands within the Fort Belknap Indian Reservation, Mont., and for other purposes.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That within one year from the date of approval of this act the Secretary of the Interior shall cause to be prepared, in such manner as he may deem advisable, a complete and final roll to contain the names of all Indians ascertained to have rights on the Fort Belknap Reservation, Mont. Immediately upon the approval of the said roll, which shall be the conclusive and final evidence of the rights of any Indian of the reservation to an allotment of land, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to allot pro rata, under rules and regulations and in such areas and classes of lands as may be prescribed by him, among such enrolled Indians all the unreserved and otherwise undisposed of lands on the Fort Belknap Reservation: *Provided*, That not exceeding 40 acres of irrigable land shall be allotted to any one Indian: *Provided further*, That trust patents of the form prescribed by existing law shall be issued in the names of the said allottees: *And provided further*, That any names found to be on the said roll fraudulently may be stricken therefrom by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, at any time within one year from the approval thereof, after giving all persons interested a full opportunity to be heard; and the fraudulent allotment shall be canceled and the lands thereof be subject to disposal under the provisions of this act: *And provided further*, That the land allotted hereunder shall be subject to any tribal leases existing at the date of approval of the said allotments.

Notwithstanding the death of any person duly enrolled as herein provided, allotment shall be made in his or her name as though living, the land embraced in such allotment to pass by descent to the legal heirs of the decedent and be subject to disposition as in the case of lands of other allottees passing upon their death.

Sec. 2. Upon the issuance of the trust patents provided for herein the Indians thus allotted are hereby declared to be citizens of the United States and entitled to all the rights, privileges, and immunities of such citizens, and the allottees shall have the benefit of and be subject to the laws, both civil and criminal, of the State in which they may reside.

Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to reserve from allotment such reasonable areas as may be needed for Indian agency, school, religious, cemetery, and administrative purposes, to remain reserved as long as needed, and as long as agency, school, and religious institutions are maintained thereon for the benefit of said Indians, and he is hereby directed to reserve for park purposes an area not to exceed 640 acres, embracing Mission Canyon in the Little Rockies, and an area not to exceed 160 acres within which is the Snake Butte Spring: *Provided*, That a patent in fee simple for not exceeding 160 acres may be issued to the duly authorized missionary board or other proper authority of any religious organization heretofore engaged in mission or school work on said reservation for such lands thereon (not included in any town site provided for herein) as have heretofore been set apart to such organization and are now used for mission or school purposes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. This bill is now being considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I think amendments should be acted upon as the bill is read.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks so. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 3, line 1, strike out the word "upon" and insert in lieu thereof the words "that upon."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 8, strike out the word "the" at the beginning of the line and insert in lieu thereof the words "that the."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 3, line 13, after the word "Indians," strike out the comma and insert a period and the following language: "Should any such lands be abandoned said lands so abandoned shall revert to the tribe and become available for allotment or other disposition."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 3, line 16, strike out the word "he" and insert in lieu thereof the words "the said Secretary."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 4. Prior to the allotments being made as authorized herein the Secretary of the Interior shall cause an examination to be made by experts of the Geological Survey of all lands of the reservation for the purpose of determining the mineral character of any thereof, but lands found to be mineral shall not be subject to allotment as herein provided: *Provided*, That such coal lands as may be required for use in connection with the construction and maintenance of the irrigation projects may be reserved for that purpose: *Provided further*, That lands valuable for timber shall be reserved for the tribal benefit, and any member of the tribes having rights in the said reservation may cut and take away from such lands such timber as he may require for fuel, fencing, or for building.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 4, line 4, strike out the word "Prior" and insert in lieu thereof the words "That prior."

The amendment was agreed to.

Page 4, line 8, strike out the words "of any" and after the word "but" insert the words "the surface of any such."

The amendment was agreed to.

Page 4, line 9, strike out the word "found" and insert in lieu thereof the word "found."

The amendment was agreed to.

Page 4, line 10, strike out the word "not."

The amendment was agreed to.

Page 4, line 10, after the word "provided," insert "but such minerals shall be reserved for the benefit of the tribe."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 5. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to reserve and set aside for town-site purposes not more than 80 acres at the present settlement of Lodge Pole, and not to exceed 80 acres at such other locations as he may deem necessary, and to lay out, survey, and plat said tracts into blocks, lots, streets, alleys, parks, and school sites: *Provided*, That the area reserved for parks and school sites shall not exceed 10 acres in any one town site; and patents shall be issued for such lands to the municipality legally charged with the care and custody of the lands hereby set aside for such purposes. That such town sites shall be appraised and disposed of as provided in section 2381 of the United States Revised Statutes: *Provided further*, That any person who, at the date when the appraisers commence their work upon the land, shall be an actual resident upon any one such lot and the owner of substantial and permanent improvements thereon, and who shall maintain his or her residence and improvements on such lot to the date of his or her application to enter, shall be entitled to enter, at any time prior to the day fixed for the public sale and at the appraised value thereof, such lot and any two additional lots of which he or she may also be in possession and upon which he or she may have substantial and permanent improvements: *And provided further*, That before making entry of any such lot or lots the applicant shall make proof, to the satisfaction of the register and receiver of the land district in which the land lies, of such residence, possession, and ownership of improvements, under such regulations as to time, notice, manner, and character of proofs as may be prescribed by the Commissioner of the General Land Office, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior: *And provided further*, That in making their appraisal of the lots so surveyed, it shall be the duty of the appraisers to ascertain the names of the residents upon and occupants of any such lots, the character and extent of the improvements thereon, and the name of the reputed owner thereof, and to report their findings in connection with their report of appraisal, which report of findings shall be taken as prima facie evidence of the facts therein set out. All such lots not so entered prior to the day fixed for the public sale shall be offered at public outcry, in their regular order, with the other unimproved and unoccupied lots. That no lot shall be sold for less than \$10: *And provided further*, That said lots, when surveyed, shall approximate 50 by 150 feet in size.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 4, line 20, strike out the word "The" and insert "That the."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 6. The construction of systems for the irrigation of the irrigable lands shall be undertaken as the needs of the Indians shall require, as determined by the Secretary of the Interior, and there is hereby appropriated the sum of \$50,000 for preliminary investigations and surveys to determine the needs of the Indians and for the commencement of such work as may be advisable at this time: *Provided*, That the cost of all such systems on this reservation, including the Milk River irrigation system, shall be assessed against the lands irrigable under the respective systems in the proportion that each acre

of irrigable lands bears to the whole area of irrigable land under each system, and such assessments shall be reimbursed to the United States under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, after the Secretary of the Interior may fix operation and maintenance charges which shall be paid as he may direct: *Provided further*, That the provision of the act of April 4, 1910 (36 Stat. L., p. 277), requiring reimbursement of the cost of the Milk River system from Indian funds, and any other act or parts thereof in conflict with this proviso, is hereby repealed: *And provided further*, That if any allottee shall receive patent in fee to his allotment before the amounts so assessed or charged against him shall have been paid to the United States, then such amount remaining unpaid shall be and become a lien upon his allotment, and the fact of such lien shall be recited in such patent and may be enforced by the Secretary of the Interior by foreclosure as a mortgage, and should any Indian sell any part of his allotment with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, the amount of any unpaid assessments or charges against the lands sold shall be and become a first lien thereon and may be enforced by the Secretary of the Interior by foreclosure as a mortgage and delivery of water to such land may be refused within the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior until all dues are paid.

Nothing in this act shall be construed to deprive any of said Indians of the Fort Belknap Reservation of the use of water appropriated and used by them for domestic purposes or for the necessary irrigation of their lands, or lands claimed and occupied or used by them, or any ditches, dams, flumes, or reservoirs constructed and used by them in the appropriation and use of said water. No Indian shall acquire any priority of right to any of the waters of said reservation as against any other Indian by priority of appropriation to an extent greater than the water necessary to the irrigation of 40 acres.

Every person entitled to allotment on the Fort Belknap Indian Reservation shall designate as a homestead 40 acres of irrigated land or 320 acres of nonirrigated land, already allotted or to be allotted hereunder, which homestead shall remain forever inalienable.

Any and all minerals, including oil and gas, on any of the lands to be allotted hereunder are reserved for the benefit of the members of the tribe in common and may be leased for mineral purposes upon the request of the tribal council under such rules, regulations, and conditions as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe, but no lease shall be made for a longer period than 10 years, but the lessees shall have the right to renewal thereof for a further period of 10 years upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe: *Provided, however*, That until the same shall be leased any Indian being the head of a family and having rights on the said reservation may take coal from any of the lands within the same for his own domestic use: *Provided further*, That allotments hereunder may be made of lands classified as valuable chiefly for coal or other minerals which may be patented as herein provided with a reservation, set forth in the patent, of the coal, oil, gas, or other mineral deposits for the benefit of the Indians having rights on the said reservation: *And provided further*, That at the expiration of 50 years from the date of approval of this act the coal, oil, gas, or other mineral deposits upon or beneath the surface of said allotted lands shall become the property of the individual allottee or his heirs.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 6, line 15, strike out "The" and insert in lieu thereof the words "That the."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 7. Sections 16 and 36 of each township, except such lands thereof as the State has heretofore received as indemnity under existing laws, are hereby granted to the State of Montana for school purposes: *Provided, however*, That for any lands thereof lost to the State by allotment, withdrawal, or otherwise under the provisions of this act, the State may through its proper officers select as indemnity other unoccupied, unreserved nonmineral and nonirrigable lands within such reservation, not exceeding two sections in any one township: *Provided further*, That all such selections by the State must be completed within one year after the approval of this act, and be made with the view to preventing any final conflict between the claims of the State and the allotments and withdrawals provided for herein: *And provided further*, That the United States shall pay to the Indians of the reservation the sum of \$2.50 an acre for the lands thus granted to the State.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 9, line 16, strike out the word "Sections" and insert in lieu thereof the words "That sections."

The amendment was agreed to.

Page 10, line 7, strike out "\$2.50" and insert "\$3."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 8. There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$85,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to pay for the lands granted to the State of Montana; and there is hereby appropriated the further sum of \$50,000, or so much thereof as may be required, to be immediately available, to be used in paying the expenses of making the roll, classifications, and allotments hereunder, in such further allotment surveys as are necessary, and in defraying the expenses of the survey, appraisal, and sales of the town sites provided for, the said \$50,000 to be reimbursable from the proceeds of the town-site sales or from other tribal funds available or that may become available for such purpose.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 10, line 9, strike out the word "There" and insert in lieu thereof the words "That there."

The amendment was agreed to.

Page 10, line 11, strike out "\$85,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$179,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 9. The lands allotted, those retained or reserved, and the surplus lands sold, set aside for town-site purposes, or otherwise disposed of, shall be subject for a period of 25 years to all the laws of the United States prohibiting the introduction of intoxicants into the

Indian country, and that the Indian allottees, whether under the care of an Indian agent or not, shall for a like period be subject to all the laws of the United States prohibiting the sale or other disposition of intoxicants to Indians.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 10, line 23, strike out "The" and insert in lieu thereof "That the."

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask some member of the Committee on Indian Affairs what is the necessity for further considering a provision like section 9 of this bill, providing that the laws prohibiting the introduction of intoxicants into the Indian country shall remain in force for any length of time? As long as the laws of the United States prohibit the introduction of intoxicants into any part of the country, whether it is Indian country or not Indian country, what is the necessity of continuing provisions that those laws forbidding the introduction of intoxicants into the Indian country shall remain in force?

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any valid reason for it as long as the constitutional amendment exists and the introduction of liquor is prohibited everywhere. It has been the custom to carry this provision in every such bill, and the committee undoubtedly followed the custom.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I presume that is the case. I think it was very desirable to do it, but when you have a constitutional amendment and a law based upon it forbidding the transportation of liquor anywhere, I do not see why we should pass a special law in reference to this matter, which I suppose means that it is only a basis for asking an appropriation for the employment of additional persons in the service of the Government.

Mr. HASTINGS. If the gentleman will permit me, this bill was introduced sometime ago and was reported last March. I agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that there is no further necessity now for section 9, and it may well be stricken from the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I move to strike out section 9.

The motion was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. EVANS of Montana, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

CERTAIN LIEU LANDS IN SOUTH DAKOTA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 397) to authorize a lieu selection by the State of South Dakota for 160 acres on Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I note that H. R. 397 is for the purpose of a lieu selection by the State of South Dakota for certain lands, which are said to be now and to have been in the possession of Trinity Episcopal Church. The report says that the land can not formally be set apart for church and mission purposes until the claim of the State has been adjusted. My inquiry is as to whether the State is to get the additional 160 acres and the church retain its 160 acres, or what is to be the procedure under this bill?

Mr. GANDY. This is on section 16, which is one of the common-school sections. After title had passed to the State it was disclosed that for many years an Episcopal Church mission had been located on this quarter section. The State now has the title. It is willing to surrender this 160 acres to the Government and take a lieu selection. After that is done, it will be a matter to be determined by the Secretary of the Interior as to what shall become of the 160 acres that the State deeded back.

Mr. GARD. The proposition is to have the State deed back the 160 acres now occupied by the Trinity Episcopal Church?

Mr. GANDY. Yes.

Mr. GARD. And then under this bill the State makes a lieu selection?

Mr. GANDY. For the 160 acres, and the disposition of the 160 acres deeded back would remain to be determined by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. GARD. In other words, it simply provides for the selection by the State of lands which have had no previous occupancy or title?

Mr. GANDY. Yes.

Mr. GARD. And the occupancy by the Trinity Episcopal Church of this land will then depend on the action of the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. GANDY. On the action of the Secretary of the Interior. The bill further provides for the return to the Government of 160 acres.

Mr. GARD. Under the law, the selection which is authorized to be made by the State of South Dakota must be approved by the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. GANDY. Yes.

Mr. GARD. Is it necessary to put that in the bill?

Mr. GANDY. No; that is a part of the law. A State must go regularly to the Secretary of the Interior with an application for a patent based on a lieu selection.

Mr. GARD. And it must have the approval of the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. GANDY. Certainly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the State of South Dakota, acting through its proper officials, is hereby authorized to select 160 acres of unappropriated, unreserved, nonmineral lands within the boundaries of the former Pine Ridge Reservation, S. Dak., or an equal area of public land of like character within the boundaries of the said State, in lieu of the northeast quarter of section 16, township 33 north, range 40 west, sixth principal meridian, in South Dakota, upon due and proper showing that the lands authorized herein to be surrendered by the State have not been sold or otherwise encumbered by it, and that the selection of such lieu lands by the said State shall be a waiver of its right, title, and claim in and to the 160-acre tract in section 16 above described: *Provided,* That in case the exchange herein contemplated shall be perfected the lands so surrendered by the State shall be held to be a part of the present Pine Ridge Reservation and subject to the laws enacted for or applicable to the said reservation.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. GANDY, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF ALASKA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 4205) to amend section 4, chapter 1 of Title I of an act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900, as heretofore amended by section 2 of an act entitled "An act to amend section 86 of an act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii, to provide for additional judges, and for other judicial purposes," approved March 3, 1909, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill has been several times on the calendar and has been up for consideration. Each time it has been reported by the Committee on the Judiciary it has been said to be in need of correction so far as the boundary line is concerned. I would inquire of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD], the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, or the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON], who reported the bill, whether the description of the boundaries contained in the bill is now correct?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. Mr. Speaker, I understood the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. GRIGSBY] was going to offer an amendment to correct that error. Personally, I do not know just what it is, but there is a little error in the description of the boundary.

Mr. GARD. The gentleman knows that there is no opposition to the bill, except that it is desired to get the description of the boundaries exactly correct.

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. That is my understanding.

Mr. GARD. And is the description of the boundary not correct?

Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON. I believe not. The gentleman from Alaska [Mr. GRIGSBY] told me the other day that he expected to make a correction.

Mr. GARD. My understanding is that the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD], had that description in his possession. In the interest of its being corrected, I am compelled to object to the consideration of it unless the gentleman has further information at this time. It is a bill to correct the judicial boundaries of the Territory of Alaska. As I understand it, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD] or the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. GRIGSBY] was to offer an amendment. I therefore ask that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEMHI NATIONAL FOREST, IDAHO.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 13051) to add certain lands to the Lemhi National Forest, Idaho.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is there anything in this bill that would in any way interfere with the present park system in regard to commercializing any part of it in the way of irrigation?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Absolutely not. There are no national parks within the State of Idaho. This proposes to extend the boundary lines of the Lemhi forest reserves, which was established by Executive order before a survey or examination of land was made, and this bill is to make the boundary conform to the character of land contemplated by the general forest reserve law.

Mr. BLANTON. There is no provision in the bill that would in any way permit anyone to put reclamation schemes in these forests?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Oh, yes; the national forests are all open to reclamation projects, but the national parks are not. The national forests are open to homestead and mineral entries as well as for storage of water for power and reclamation purposes.

Mr. BLANTON. But it would not extend over into the park system.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. No; there is no national park in the State of Idaho.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right further to object, I note that there are some 400,000 acres to be added to this park or to the park area. My understanding is that a great portion of this area is in broken pieces, and that it makes no collective body of ground, and, in fact, to a greater or less extent it is noncontiguous to the park. Is that correct?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. This particular reserve is in broken areas, because it takes in a section of the country where there are mountain ranges and valleys, but these different areas are in one national forest for the purpose of administration.

Mr. GARD. What advantage can there be, or what is the policy in the matter of extension of the boundaries of national parks when the survey of the boundaries begins to take in noncontiguous territory under the name of national forest?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. This is not a national park; it is a national forest. It is timberland that has been set aside by Executive order with a view of preserving the timber and stream flow. All of this reserve and most of the others in Idaho were created by Executive order before the law was passed throwing upon the Congress the responsibility of creating forest reserves, and it was done before the land was examined as to its character. It is found now on examination that there is a great deal of land on the public domain that should be within the national forest in order to conserve the timber and the stream flow.

Mr. GARD. The report of the Secretary of the Interior states that there are 13 noncontiguous areas as described in the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Yes; that is true.

Mr. SINNOTT. The Secretary states they join several divisions of the national forest. With one exception, he says they do.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. It is not unusual to have a national forest in parcels because of the topography and character of the land. Valleys are not included in the national forest. The valleys between mountain ranges in that section of the country are not included, but for administrative purposes it is a great convenience to have the mountain ranges under one reserve.

Mr. GARD. I also note that the Secretary of the Interior recommends an amendment which the bill does not follow. The Secretary of the Interior, on page 7 of the report, asks that an amendment be included in the bill "that all unappropriated public lands within the following-described areas," and so forth.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I did not catch the gentleman's question.

Mr. GARD. The Secretary of the Interior suggests that there should be an amendment, said suggestion being found on page 7 of the report, "that all unappropriated public lands within the following-described areas," and so forth. That language is not contained in the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. There is no objection to having those words inserted. We endeavored to follow the suggested amendment of the Secretary.

Mr. GARD. The Secretary of the Interior, on page 7 of the report. The gentleman doubtless has it before him.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. We will accept that amendment. It is simply explanatory. Of course, it does not include appropriated public lands to the exclusion of rights which have been initiated.

Mr. SINNOTT. Under the amendment inserted in the bill there is an absolute distinction made as to what land may go in.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. The amendment on page 1 provides that these lands shall be set aside only on the approval of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. GARD. The point I was making—I do not know it is especially valuable, except it is a suggestion of the Secretary of the Interior—is that the language of the amendment he suggests is not followed in the amendment offered by the committee. The gentleman from Idaho says he has no objection to its being followed.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I have no objection to its being inserted, although I do not think it is material.

Mr. GARD. I understand so. I merely thought, inasmuch as he has suggested that, that the gentleman doubtless was trying to follow the amendment suggested by the Secretary of Agriculture and Secretary of the Interior, and possibly it should be kept in. What is the advantage, may I ask, if this bill is passed by the House, that accrues either public or private?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Well, it is valuable to the Government in this way: Lands in forest reserves that are good pasture bring a revenue to the Federal Treasury, whereas if they are out on the public domain they bring no revenue. It is an advantage to the stockmen of the country, because the land embraced within the forest reserves adapted to grazing is taken care of and guarded, and roving bands of sheep on the public domain will not tramp down the pasture within the national forest.

It is not only an advantage to the Government to have this land within the national forest, but also of advantage to the stockmen living in the vicinity of the national forest, and it is on their earnest petition that the bill was introduced. There is no objection to the bill by the stockmen or from any other source.

Mr. GARD. Is there any purpose within this bill to create a private ownership in water rights in this territory?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Of course, any rights that have attached to the public lands will be preserved, and if the rights have not attached the law affecting water rights will apply to lands within national forests just as they do upon the public domain.

Mr. GARD. The gentleman from California seems desirous of being recognized.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Idaho a question if I may. Does this add 200,000 acres of public land to the area administered by the Forest Service?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Yes; with the permission of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. ELSTON. Now, the gentleman is in favor also of including large acreages of this land under the administration of the Forest Service for the public good?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Yes.

Mr. ELSTON. Is the gentleman opposed to the inclusion of like areas of public domain which are distinctively attractive for park purposes if they are under the administration of the park service?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Yes; I am opposed to such inclusion if within those areas there should be any water-power site or any reservoir site that could be utilized for irrigation purposes.

Mr. ELSTON. In the event there was no provision in an act including such areas into park areas, and making a proviso that the areas should be subject to the administration of the water-power act, can the gentleman see any great objection to it then?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Yes, I can; because of the attitude of certain interests against the use of any reservoir site within national parks. I think it would be very unwise legislation to tie up any more land on the public domain within the boundaries of a national park, because of the attitude of certain officials and private citizens who contend that land within a national-park area is sacred and must not be disturbed for any purpose.

Mr. ELSTON. What limitations will be placed upon these 400,000 acres if it goes into the forest area, in regard to the use of water and minerals?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. None whatever. It is still open for use, just the same as if it had never been taken into the national forest. The water power act would apply to land on the national forests just as land in the public domain.

Mr. ELSTON. Without check by the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. We provide especially here that the Secretary of the Interior shall have these lands examined and only the additions to the forest reserve shall be made by his consent and approval.

Mr. ELSTON. The inclusion of this area under the administration of the forest reserve will remove it for all time from taxation, where there is probability now that it will be homesteaded and be subject to taxation?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. None of these areas will be homesteaded. The 640 homestead act has been in force three years, and they have not been applied for to any great extent. If they have initiated a claim they can get their patent to the land if they comply with the law.

Mr. ELSTON. Then the gentleman does not believe, with all the considerations he urges in objecting to any park bill, that they are applicable to the present bill?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Absolutely not, because we do not take away from the people any right to the use of water for irrigation or power purposes, which would be the case if these lands were embraced in a national forest.

Mr. ELSTON. The gentleman must concede, then, that I am somewhat charitable in not objecting, when the gentleman expects to object to my bill a few minutes later?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following-described lands are hereby added to and made parts of the Lemhi National Forest, subject to all laws applicable to national forests; but the addition of these lands shall not affect adversely any valid existing entry or claim established prior to the passage of this act:

Boise meridian and base: Township 2 north, range 23 east, sections 1, 2, 3, 10, 11, and 12. Township 2 north, range 24 east, sections 6 and 7. Township 3 north, range 22 east, sections 13, 14, 23, 24, 25, and 26. Township 3 north, range 23 east, sections 12, 13, 19; sections 23 to 30, inclusive; sections 34, 35, and 36. Township 3 north, range 24 east, sections 1 and 2; section 5, west half; sections 6 and 7; section 8, west half; sections 11, 12, 13, and 14; section 17, west half; sections 18 and 19; section 20, west half; section 29, west half; sections 30 and 31. Township 4 north, range 24 east, sections 12 and 13; sections 23 to 26, inclusive; sections 31, 35, and 36. Township 4 north, range 25 east, sections 1 to 5 inclusive; sections 7 to 12, inclusive; sections 17 to 20, inclusive; sections 29 to 32, inclusive. Township 4 north, range 28 east, sections 2 to 11, inclusive; sections 14 to 21, inclusive. Township 5 north, range 24 east, sections 1 to 25, inclusive. Township 5 north, range 25 east, sections 4 to 9, inclusive; sections 17 to 20, inclusive; sections 23 to 27, inclusive; sections 33 to 36, inclusive. Township 5 north, range 26 east, sections 1, 12, 13, 24, and 25. Township 5 north, range 27 east, sections 5 to 11, inclusive; sections 14 to 30, inclusive. Township 5 north, range 28 east, sections 11, 14, 23, 25 to 36, inclusive. Township 6 north, range 24 east, sections 4 to 9, inclusive; sections 16 to 36, inclusive. Township 6 north, range 26 east, sections 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 23, 24, and 25; section 26, east half; section 36, all. Township 6 north, range 27 east, sections 19, 30, 31, and 32. Township 7 north, range 19 east, sections 1 to 4, inclusive; sections 10 to 12, inclusive. Township 7 north, range 20 east, sections 1, 2, 10, 11, and 12. Township 7 north, range 21 east, sections 1 to 12, inclusive. Township 7 north, range 22 east, sections 4 to 18, inclusive; sections 23 and 24. Township 7 north, range 23 east, sections 17 to 24, inclusive; sections 28, 29, 30, 32, and 33. Township 7 north, range 24 east, sections 13, 19, 24, 30, and 31. Township 7 north, range 25 east, sections 19, 20, and 21. Township 7 north, range 26 east, sections 20, 28, 29, 32, and 33. Township 8 north, range 19 east, sections 1 to 5, inclusive; sections 8 to 17, inclusive; sections 20 to 29, inclusive; sections 33 to 36, inclusive. Township 8 north, range 20 east, sections 1 to 23, inclusive; sections 28, 29, 30, and 31. Township 8 north, range 21 east, sections 25, 26, 27; sections 31 to 36, inclusive. Township 8 north, range 22 east, sections 30 and 31. Township 8 north, range 23 east, sections 4, 5, and 6; section 7, north half; section 8, north half; section 9, all. Township 8 north, range 26 east, sections 1 to 4, inclusive; sections 10 to 13, inclusive. Township 8 north, range 27 east, sections 5 to 8, inclusive; sections 17 to 20, inclusive; sections 29, 30, and 32. Township 9 north, range 22 east, sections 3, 4, 11, 13, 14, 23, and 25. Township 9 north, range 23 east, section 31, all. Township 9 north, range 24 east, sections 1 to 4, inclusive; section 12, all. Township 9 north, range 25 east, sections 1 to 17, inclusive; sections 21 to 26, inclusive; sections 35 and 36. Township 9 north, range 26 east, section 10, south half; sections 14, 15, and 16; sections 19 to 36, inclusive. Township 9 north, range 27 east, sections 30, 31, and 32. Township 9 north, range 29 east, sections 4, 5, 6, and 9; section 10, south half; section 11, south half. Township 9 north, range 30 east, sections 1 and 12. Township 9 north, range 31 east, sections 6, 7, 8, 16, 17, 18, and 21. Township 10 north, range 22 east, sections 5 to 8, inclusive; sections 16, 17, 20, 21, 28, 29, and 33. Township 10 north, range 29 east, sections 7, 18, 19, and 20; sections 29 to 33, inclusive. Township 10 north, range 30 east, sections 1 to 4, inclusive; sections 9 to 16, inclusive; sections 21 to 28, inclusive; sections 34, 35, and 36. Township 10 north, range 31 east, sections 19, 30, and 31. Township 11 north, range 21 east, section 4, east half; sections 13, 14, and 15; sections 22 to 27, inclusive; sections 34, 35, and 36. Township 11 north, range 22 east, section 1, all; sections 19, 29, 30, 31, and 32. Township 11 north, range 23 east, sections 5 and 6. Township 11 north, range 30 east, sections 5, 6, 8, and 17; section 20, east half; sections 21, 27, 28, 33, and 34. Township 12 north, range 21 east, sections 7 and 18; section 19, east half; section 29, all; section 32, north half; section 33, all. Township 12 north, range 22

east, section 36, all. Township 12 north, range 23 east, section 31, all. Township 12 north, range 24 east, sections 2 to 11, inclusive. Township 12 north, range 29 east, sections 1 to 4, inclusive; section 9, east half; sections 10 to 15, inclusive; section 22, east half; sections 23, 24, and 25; section 26, east half; section 36, all. Township 12 north, range 30 east, sections 5 to 8, inclusive; sections 17 to 20, inclusive; sections 29 to 32, inclusive. Township 13 north, range 24 east, sections 5, 9, 15, 22, 27, and 35. Township 13 north, range 29 east, sections 26 to 29, inclusive; sections 32 to 36, inclusive. Township 13 north, range 30 east, section 31, all. Township 14 north, range 23 east, sections 2 to 5, inclusive; section 8, east half; sections 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, and 15; section 24, east half. Township 14 north, range 24 east, sections 19, 20, and 29; section 30, east half; section 32, all. Township 15 north, range 22 east, sections 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 23, 24, and 25. Township 15 north, range 23 east, sections 18, 19, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, and 34. Township 16 north, range 22 east, sections 23, 33, and 34.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 3, after the word "described," strike out all the remainder of lines 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, up to and including the word "act," and insert: "areas, found by the Secretary of Agriculture to be chiefly valuable for the production of timber or the protection of stream flow, may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, be included within and made a part of the Lemhi National Forest, in Idaho, by proclamation of the President, said lands to be thereafter subject to all laws affecting national forests."

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, to strike out, on page—

The SPEAKER. Is it an amendment to the amendment?

Mr. GARD. It is to carry out the request of the Secretary of the Interior, which is to strike out the words, on line 3, "the following-described," and insert after the word "That," the words "all unappropriated lands within the following-described."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARD: Page 1, amend the committee amendment by striking out the words "the following-described," on page 1, line 3, and insert: "all unappropriated public lands within the following-described."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD].

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment as amended by the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The following committee amendments were severally read and agreed to:

Page 3, line 2, strike out "25" and insert "35" in lieu thereof.

Page 3, line 9, strike out the word "five" and insert the word "three."

Page 5, line 4, insert after the word "twenty-three" the word "twenty-four."

Page 6, line 3, strike out the word "to" and insert the word "and."

Page 6, line 24, after the word "eleven" strike out the word "inclusive."

Page 7, line 9, strike out "26" and insert in lieu thereof "27."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. SMITH of Idaho, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

LESSEES AT CAMP FUNSTON, KANS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 3706) authorizing the Secretary of War to make settlement with the lessees who erected buildings on a five-year lease on the zone at Camp Funston, Kans., and for other purposes.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made. The Clerk will report the next bill.

ASSESSMENT WORK ON MINING CLAIMS.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that House joint resolution 404 be stricken from the calendar.

The SPEAKER. It does not require unanimous consent to do that. The gentleman can object.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman asks that it be stricken from the Union Calendar.

Mr. RHODES. I do that for this reason, Mr. Speaker: A companion measure [S. 4565] was introduced and passed the Senate on December 13, 1920. It was referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining of the House, and reported December 17, and placed on the Union Calendar. The rules were suspended

and the bill was passed on December 20, 1920, and approved on December 31, and is now a law.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the best way of proceeding would be to lay the companion resolution on the table. That is the customary proceeding.

Mr. GARD. What is the bill?

The SPEAKER. It is House joint resolution 404, Calendar No. 300.

Mr. RHODES. I will do that, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

RELIEF OF WAR MINERAL PRODUCERS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 13091) to provide further for the relief of war minerals producers, and to amend an act entitled "An act to provide relief in cases of contracts connected with the prosecution of the war, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1919.

The title of the bill was read.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas objects. The Clerk will read the next bill.

EXCHANGE OF LANDS WITHIN RAINIER NATIONAL FOREST, WASH.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 11851) authorizing the exchange of lands within Rainier National Forest, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, pending the calling of the next bill, is the bill by Mr. GARLAND the mines and mining bill?

The SPEAKER. That has been objected to.

Mr. GARD. What became of the bill immediately preceding that?

The SPEAKER. That was taken from the calendar.

Mr. KNUTSON. That was transferred to the Union Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do so for the purpose of making an inquiry of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON], who either reported the bill or is the author of the bill, regarding H. R. 11851. Will the gentleman state its purpose and public benefit?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. This bill is similar to bills which have been passed heretofore in order to secure water supply to Salt Lake City and Colorado Springs and Portland, Oreg., and Seattle, Wash., and others. The necessity arises for the city of Tacoma to have a different and better water supply. Back of the city are high mountains. A large portion of that area is in a forest reserve, and in that reserve the Government does not own all the sections, but in parts of the reserve every other section was allotted originally to the Northern Pacific Railroad Co., and is now in possession of others. In order to secure this water supply it is necessary to have control of certain sections of land. The city proposes to use a canyon, and dam the lower end of it, control the watershed, and to give to the Government other forest lands, privately owned, in that reservation in exchange for those needed by the city. The practice has been recognized in these previous bills to which I referred, and is necessary. It is the only way in which the city can secure a better water supply.

Mr. GARD. The bill has for its purpose the procurement of a water supply for the city of Tacoma?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. GARD. The first section provides for certain transfers of land; for the United States to accept ownership and transfer other land in lieu thereof?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. GARD. What is the character of the land which the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept, and what is its comparative value, if it has any value, with respect to that which is given for this purpose?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The land which the Secretary will accept will be superior to the land in question, for the land in question is either in the bed of this former glacier or is on abrupt lifts or cascades on the sides.

As I have just explained, every other section in this particular tract in the forest reserve is privately owned. The city buys that, and the city then uses a measure of this kind to secure the right to exchange the land for other land and give up better lands in the true forest for those in the reserve.

These lands, except those on the river bed, are covered with unmerchantable timber, and even if it were merchantable, it could not be logged and handled.

Mr. BEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. BEE. Do the benefits which accrue to the city for this grant justify the city in purchasing more expensive property?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. BEE. That is the reason for the proposed exchange—the benefit that will accrue to them?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That is it.

Mr. CARTER. How much of this land is it proposed to exchange?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The Public Lands Committee caused an amendment to be inserted, covering—designating each section—20 in all.

Mr. CARTER. How much land is there at present in Mount Rainier National Forest Reserve?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I can not say offhand, but it is a great amount. It is one-half as large, probably, as the smallest of the New England States. It is a very large area.

Mr. CARTER. I have been over it. It is a beautiful country, but the land is perfectly worthless except for timber up there.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. This is not even good for timber. After the gentleman got out 20 miles or so from Tacoma he rode along the edge of a canyon where he could look down into the Nisqually gorge—with the river perhaps 2,500 feet below.

Mr. CARTER. Beyond the glacier?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Many miles before you reach the snout of the glacier. Now that timber is fairly merchantable; but as you come down toward Puget Sound, still following that old glacial bed, the sloping sides have some timber on them, that is scrubby, unmarketable, and worthless.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman proposes to exchange acre for acre, does he?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The equivalent of acre for acre. I have a letter from the chief forester saying that the Forest Service is glad to do it.

Mr. GARD. What is the acreage which will come to the Government in the exchange?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It will be selected by the forest reserve people.

Mr. SINNOTT. The bill provides "not to exceed an equal value."

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The gentleman is correct. It is for equal value.

Mr. GARD. Any lands not in Government ownership.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Lands of equal value not owned by the Government. These exchanges are carried out under the supervision of the chief forester. I have a letter from the chief forester in which he says they are very glad to cooperate, and that it is their purpose to assist western cities in securing water supplies.

Mr. GARD. How much of the land is to be set aside for the Tacoma water supply? How large an acreage will that be?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does the gentleman mean how much is to be exchanged?

Mr. GARD. How much will come to the city of Tacoma by this, of land which belongs to the Federal Government?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It will be a matter of adjudication by Government officials. They will select some of those sections further up in the reserve which are privately owned, and which have on them real timber which is accessible. This letter from the forester says:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FOREST SERVICE,
Washington, January 3, 1920.

HON. ALBERT JOHNSON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: Reference is made to your inquiry respecting the desire of the city of Tacoma, Wash., to acquire the use of certain national forest lands in connection with a contemplated new source of water supply for the city.

It is gathered from Mayor Riddell's letter of December 17 to you that the construction of a new reservoir is proposed, and that the city's officials are particularly desirous that the watershed be protected in such a manner as to reduce the possibilities of contamination of the water to a minimum.

As to the construction of any works on national forest lands, this may be authorized under section 4 of the act of February 1, 1905 (33 Stat., p. 628), which would give the city a right of way amounting to an easement for any dams, reservoirs, water plants, ditches, flumes, pipes, tunnels, and canals which may be constructed on national forest lands. An application for a grant under this act should be filed in the United States land office at Seattle, Wash., in accordance with instructions of the Department of the Interior relating to the preparation of plats, etc.

As to the protection of the watershed, I feel sure that this can be handled to the entire satisfaction of the city's officials under a coopera-

tive agreement between the Secretary of Agriculture on one side and the city's representatives on the other. Agreements of this character have been entered into with a number of municipalities, including the city of Seattle; Salt Lake, Utah; Colorado Springs, Colo.; and a number of smaller cities, which obtain their water supply from the national forests.

I shall be very glad to ask the district forester at Portland, Oreg., to get in touch with the mayor of Tacoma and arrange for a conference with him, where this whole matter can be gone into fully and the nature of the agreement which the department has hitherto favored in like cases fully explained to the city's representatives.

It is perhaps unnecessary to say that the Forest Service is heartily in favor of doing everything it can in aiding municipalities which obtain their water supply from the national forests in securing and maintaining an adequate supply of pure water for the needs of the city's inhabitants.

The papers which you submitted to me are returned, copies having been made for the information of the district forester.

Very sincerely, yours,

H. S. GRAVES, Forester.

Mr. GARD. What is the present source of the water supply for the city of Tacoma?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. In the last 10 or 12 years the source of the water supply for the city of Tacoma has been mountain reservoirs. The electric power for that city is secured from water in reservoirs in that canyon 20 miles up, before they reach the forest reserve. Great quantities of water are impounded there by the city for a municipal electric lighting plant, but that water can not be used for drinking purposes, because it comes out from under the bottom of the glacier and carries arsenic in such quantities as to make it undesirable for drinking.

Mr. GARD. In some statement in the report I see that the water supply is polluted, because certain transcontinental railroads run adjacent to it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes. A few years ago it was necessary to pass a bill similar to this covering a very wide area for the city of Seattle, and that bill gave protection for what is known as the Green River watershed, and one reason for that protection was that two or three transcontinental railroads crossed that watershed. As a result of the passage of that act, by which the city was enabled to control that portion of that watershed, the exits to the lavatories on the transcontinental railroad trains have to be stopped while the trains are crossing the watershed.

All that this bill does is to make an exchange of lands, and then the city of Tacoma exercises police and fire patrol and keeps off transient or migratory people, hunters, and others for the purpose of guaranteeing a pure water supply.

We have attached to this report the laws passed in previous cases. The city of Portland, Oreg., secured a similar law, and even went so far as to forbid the grazing or moving of cattle on the Bull Run watershed.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. With pleasure.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I observe that in section 2 there is a provision that the President and the Secretary of Agriculture may exercise the right to forbid persons other than forest officers and those authorized by the municipal authorities from entering or otherwise trespassing upon reservations made in the interest of these watersheds.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Is there any danger of that right being abused, so as to interfere with the purposes of the park?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Oh, no. This is not a park. This is a forest reserve. There is a great forest reserve there covering many miles in all directions. In the center of that forest reserve is the Mount Rainier National Park. This particular place is 20 miles, probably, from where the park begins.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. That is what I wanted to ask the question about—whether it is anywhere near the national park, so that there is any danger of encroachment on the use of the park.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Not at all. Neither does this interfere with any of the natural lines of communication to and from the park.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. What is the population of the city of Tacoma, according to the last census?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Ninety-seven thousand, I think.

Mr. LINTHICUM. For what distance do they have to get the water?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I would have to make a guess, but I suspect 25 miles.

Mr. BLANTON. That is not very far.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. No; that is not far in that country.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to accept on behalf of the United States title to any lands not in Government ownership within the Rainier National Forest which, in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture, are chiefly valuable for national forest purposes, and in exchange therefor may give not to exceed an equal value of such Government timber or land in any national forest in the State of Washington as may be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture and acceptable to the owner as fair compensation, considering any reservations which either the grantor or the Government may make of timber, mineral, or easements. Timber given in such exchanges shall be cut and removed under the direction and supervision and in accordance with the requirements of the Secretary of Agriculture. Lands conveyed to the United States under this act shall, upon acceptance of title, become parts of the Rainier National Forest.

SEC. 2. That the President is hereby authorized, upon application by a municipality, to reserve and set aside from all forms of location, entry, or appropriation, under either the mineral or nonmineral land laws of the United States, any lands of the United States within the exterior boundaries of the Rainier National Forest which, in his judgment, are essential for the protection of the water supply of such municipality, and such reservation shall remain in force until revoked by him or by act of Congress, said lands thereafter to be administered for watershed protection by the Secretary of Agriculture in co-operation with the municipality for whose benefit they were reserved, and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, in addition to the rules and regulations authorized by the act of June 4, 1897 (30 Stat., 11), and acts supplemental thereto and amendatory thereof, to prescribe and enforce rules and regulations necessary to carry out the purpose of this act, including the right to forbid persons other than forest officers and those authorized by the municipal authorities from entering or otherwise trespassing upon such reservations. Any violation of this act or of regulations issued thereunder shall be punishable as is provided for in section 50 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States, approved March 4, 1909" (35 Stat. L., 1098), as amended by the act of Congress approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. L., 857).

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "ownership," insert: "in sections 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 27, 29, and 31 in township 14 north, range 4 east, Willamette meridian; sections 13 and 25 in township 14 north, range 3 east, Willamette meridian; and sections 21, 27, 29, 33, and 35 in township 15 north, range 4 east, Willamette meridian."

Page 2, line 9, after the word "which," strike out the words "either the grantor or."

Page 2, line 10, after the word "make," strike out the words "of timber, mineral, or easements."

The committee amendments were severally reported and severally agreed to.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MANN of Illinois: Page 3, line 6, after the word "prescribe," insert the words "from time to time."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last paragraph, and I do it for the purpose of calling the attention of the Committee on Rules and of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] to the following facts: The bill under consideration appears on the Unanimous Consent Calendar. On a day such as this the calendar is worth something to the Members of Congress because we can look at it in the morning and find out what bills are to be called up under it, but I call the attention of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] and the Rules Committee to the fact that under paragraph 5 of Rule XIII this calendar has to be printed every day. There are 128 pages of printed matter. There are very few changes in it from day to day. The changes would not amount to half an inch of space. Yet, under that paragraph 5 of Rule XIII, the whole document has to be reprinted every day. Suspension day comes twice a month, on the first and third Mondays, and on such first and third Mondays these unanimous-consent bills can be called up. There is some reason why this calendar should be printed just before each suspension day, which would be twice a month.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. When the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] came here, and when I came here, the calendar was not printed every day. It was printed two or three times a week.

Mr. BLANTON. Twice a month I think it ought to be printed.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. It was that way for a long time. As far as I was individually concerned, I think I never made any complaint about it, but there was serious complaint about it. I do not remember just when it came, but the House determined to change it and have the calendar printed every day as a matter of convenience. This is the historical situation.

Mr. BLANTON. I knew the gentleman would know its historical history, if anyone would. Let me suggest this: An appropriation bill may take five days of the time of the House. Surely during the consideration of that appropriation bill, when everyone knows that that is the only measure that is likely to come up, it would be quite a saving to the Government to stop the printing of these 128 pages in this calendar every day during that time. I think if it were printed just the day before suspension day, so that on the Monday morning of the first and third Mondays every Member of the House who wanted to keep up with what was going on could obtain one and be thoroughly advised as to what was going to come up, it would be quite sufficient and it would be quite a saving to the Government.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I am curious to know whether or not the gentleman from Texas would be willing to have the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD held in manuscript form and not printed as a matter of economy?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, no.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Does he not think that would be a good idea?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, no. I dare say that except before each suspension day this calendar is not read by over 20 Members of the House.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Does the gentleman not think that we could expedite public business if the proceedings of the House in detail were not printed each morning?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, no. I think it is the greatest safeguard to the American people that there can be, and I think it is the best money spent by the Government.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Does the gentleman realize how much it would cost to print the RECORD if all of the Members of Congress occupied as much time on the floor as the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. BLANTON. I want to state to the gentleman that I have a right to use the time of the House, because I am here more than most Members. With the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and a few other Members, I am here and stay here and work all of the time, and I have a right to be heard. If the gentleman would stay here as much as I do, he would have as much right to be heard.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Oh, well, I think my record for attendance will compare favorably with the record of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman butted into this matter and I want to butt him out.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. My "butting in" seems to have embarrassed the gentleman.

Mr. BLANTON. Not at all. It would take more than the gentleman from Idaho to embarrass the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, of course this discussion is a little out of order, and I suggest to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] that the matter is one which he might very properly take up with the proper committee. Let me make this suggestion, however, with regard to the calendar.

When one takes up the calendar of the House at any time, they expect to secure accurate information as to the status of different bills at that time. The situation with regard to bills is changing constantly. It is true there are times when there are not many bills reported for a day or two—some one or two or three days may pass in which not many bills are placed on the Unanimous Consent Calendar—but there is enough shifting in the situation in regard to bills reported or disposed of that at times one might be seriously misled and wholly uninformed if the calendar were not right up to date. I do not assert that we might not, without any serious detriment to the public business or inconvenience to Members, go back to the old practice, but I think if a change is to be urged it ought to be considered by the appropriate committee and all sides and views of the subject presented.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Washington, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF WAR MINERAL PRODUCERS.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise? Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for two minutes and to refer to the bill preceding the one we have just been considering.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I regret very much that there was objection to the immediate consideration of that bill, H. R. 13091, introduced and reported out of the Committee on Mines and Mining by our former colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. GARLAND]. I will not attempt to discuss the merits of the bill in two minutes. I only desire to mention one matter in connection with that bill. I believe the best showing for financial economy that has ever been made by any commission established or authorized by Congress that I have ever heard of has been made by that War Minerals Commission, the chairman of which is former Senator John F. Shafroth, of Colorado. I know there is some complaint against the commission for being overstrict and exceedingly zealous in guarding the rights of the Government. But from a financial standpoint, in saving money to the Federal Treasury, the commission has certainly made a unique and remarkable record. Commissions always spend all the money appropriated for them and then ask for more. Congress authorized that commission to expend \$8,500,000, and I understand they will be ready to wind up their business early in March of this year, and they have expended less than \$3,000,000 and will turn back into the Federal Treasury approximately \$5,500,000 of the amount that we authorized them to expend for a most worthy and laudable purpose. The commission has examined nearly 1,200 claims, at a total cost of less than 2 per cent of the total amount of the claims handled. That feature of the commission's work is so remarkably unprecedented that I wanted to mention it in passing over that bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I have only two minutes.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman should yield to me; I was the one who objected, and I want to tell the gentleman why.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Just a moment, if the gentleman please.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I asked the chief clerk of that commission the other day for a statement down to date of their financial operations. He answered in the form of a letter. It is very short, and I ask to have it go in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask an extension of my time for one minute to read the letter into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WINGO. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes on this same subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WINGO. I object.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (S. DOC. NO. 353).

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report from the Acting Secretary of State inclosing a draft of a joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to permit Mr. Jose A. de la Torriente, a citizen of Cuba, to receive instruction at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis at the expense of the Government of Cuba.

The Acting Secretary of State points out that the passage of the resolution would be regarded as an act of courtesy by the Government of Cuba, and that it would follow established precedents.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

17 January, 1921.

The SPEAKER. Referred with accompanying papers to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

HOSPITALS FOR BENEFICIARIES OF THE BUREAU OF WAR RISK INSURANCE.

The next business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was House joint resolution 411, authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to enter into an agreement to lease or to execute lease for hospitals acquired or to be constructed by the State of New York, or other States of the United States of

America, for the care and treatment of beneficiaries of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask that this resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks that this resolution be passed without prejudice. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest that one reason I ask that is that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DUNN], the author of the resolution, is not present. Another is that the Committee on Rules has agreed to bring in a rule in a few days for the consideration of this hospital question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I did not hear the gentleman's statement about bringing in a rule of some kind.

Mr. LANGLEY. I said there would be a rule brought in within a few days bringing this whole subject before the House.

Mr. GARD. Just the one subject of this bill, or the entire subject?

Mr. LANGLEY. In reference to the entire hospital situation.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I do not think any action we may take at this time should be predicated on what may occur hereafter.

Mr. LANGLEY. I wanted the House to understand the situation.

Mr. MONDELL. Section 1 of this bill, I think, should be passed; section 2 should not. There ought not to be objection to the passage of section 1 at this time. Section 2 of the bill is rather too broad and far-reaching to be considered by unanimous consent.

Mr. LANGLEY. If the gentleman will permit me, I want to make this statement: I received a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury covering this entire subject, and I have called a meeting of the committee for Wednesday to consider that in connection with the bill which the Rules Committee report will make in order.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LANGLEY. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. Was there not some action taken on a similar bill in the Senate?

Mr. LANGLEY. My understanding is that in another body this same proposition was turned down by the Committee on Appropriations. I desire to say that I am heartily in favor of this measure or any other measure that will give relief to the very urgent situation that now exists with regard to the treatment of our disabled ex-service men, and I have been pressing such action all I could, and I shall continue to do so.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman speaks about a rule for a bill. Explain to the House to what bill the gentleman refers.

Mr. LANGLEY. I refer to the bill introduced and reported at the last session by me which authorized an appropriation of \$10,000,000 for the construction of five hospitals in different sections of the country, two of them for tubercular cases and three for shell-shock cases.

Mr. CARTER. If I understand the gentleman, the other legislative branch of this Congress has already rejected a bill for the renting of hospitals from States?

Mr. LANGLEY. The New York proposition? Yes, sir, as I understand it.

Mr. CARTER. And the gentleman proposes in the other bill that the Government shall enter into the erection of these hospitals?

Mr. LANGLEY. The gentleman states the situation correctly.

Mr. BLANTON. When the people of New York State are constantly leaving that State for Arizona and New Mexico because of being afflicted with tuberculosis in order to get relief, does the gentleman think it wise to place tubercular hospitals in New York State?

Mr. LANGLEY. That is not the proposition. It is not proposed to place any there by this bill.

Mr. BLANTON. You could under this proposition rent them there?

Mr. LANGLEY. Yes; one of them, but not—

Mr. BLANTON. That is what I was driving at. I think in framing legislation to erect tubercular hospitals, such hospitals ought to be placed in a country where the altitude and the climate make it possible to have successful treatment.

Mr. MADDEN. It does not make any difference what the climate is in the treatment of tuberculosis.

Mr. LANGLEY. There is a variety of medical opinion on the subject, but I think the latest medical thought conforms to what the gentleman from Illinois says.

Mr. MADDEN. We have the best tubercular hospital in the world located in Chicago.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. And I want to say in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] that this hospital to be leased from the State of New York is for the purpose of treating mental and nervous disorders, and not tuberculosis.

Mr. CARTER. I would like to have unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a statement of Senator JONES in relation to this matter, taken from the Washington Post.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I do not think that ought to be done. I do not know why, if we can not be heard on it, Senator JONES should be heard.

Mr. CARTER. I expect the gentleman from Illinois saw the article. The Senator just gave statistics and figures.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the bill being passed without prejudice?

There was no objection.

IMPROVEMENT OF RED LAKE AND RED LAKE RIVER, MINN.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 14311) to authorize the improvement of Red Lake and Red Lake River, in the State of Minnesota, for navigation, drainage, and flood control purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. GARD. I reserve the right to object for the purpose of making an inquiry regarding this particular bill of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] and the others who are interested. The report seems to be rather inadequate, and therefore I am asking for information from him and others who may know about it. The report shows a short statement by the Secretary of War and then recites that it was also submitted to the Secretary of the Interior, and that extended conferences with him were held, and the Secretary recommended a large number of amendments, but we are not advised in the report of whether he approves or anything else. I am asking for additional information under the reservation I have made.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, the bill was introduced in February, and extensive hearings were held. The principal of the Northwest School of Agriculture, a branch of the University of Minnesota, came down, and we held a conference with the Secretary of the Interior, and some 15 or 20 amendments were agreed to, and with those amendments the bill was satisfactory to the Interior Department. I brought back those amendments to the Committee on Flood Control, and the committee unanimously said that I had best incorporate them in the bill and reintroduce it. They amended it the next day and reported the amended bill without any amendments appearing in print, because they were technical and very numerous. That was done the next day after the agreement had been made. And the clerks of the Interior Department had not yet transmitted the Secretary's letter. The Secretary's letter, however, came the next day, approving the bill, just as they said they would, and I have a photostatic copy of the letter, which letter approves of the bill, because we included all the amendments suggested by the Interior Department, which is the guardian of the Indians. And this concerns them, because part of the land is in an Indian reservation. As I have said, the bill was satisfactory to the Department of the Interior. When that report was written that letter was on its way toward the House. It was on the 29th of May, and the session was going to end in a few days. We had a telephone message that the letter was on the way when that report was written, and the letter came the very next day.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I would like to ask the gentleman what the nature of the improvement is going to be and at whose expense?

Mr. STEENERSON. This item was first carried in the river and harbor bill of 1916. It had a clause in it improving the navigation, and a survey was authorized, and they were to take into consideration the local interests. It turned out that local interests were about all there was to it. The interests that are to be contributed to this improvement are some 250,000 or 260,000 acres of privately owned land along the river and about the same amount of land in the Indian reservation.

I will show the gentleman on the map. Here [indicating] is the Red Lake, and this river flows some 15 miles from Red Lake until it enters the privately owned land. Now, the fall here is only about 5 inches to the mile, and the land on both sides of this, the Indian land, is rich soil, but owing to the fact that this lake has a large watershed, the land is flooded every sum-

mer and is absolutely useless for agriculture, although if we could control the outlet it would be fertile, rich land. The Indians are interested. They have long been wanting to drain it, but there is no way to do it without this outlet here [indicating]. And these people from the line of the reservation west are also flooded to some extent. These lands will be assessed some \$250,000. This is only a preliminary estimate by the War Department engineers. Two hundred and thirty-six thousand is estimated to be the benefit on the Indian lands. The War Department recommends that it be done by a municipal corporation or drainage district, to be organized under the laws of Minnesota. That is in the report of the engineer. Minnesota did pass the appropriate legislation, and the drainage survey of the district is authorized. It is authorized to tax privately owned land and tax benefits derived by water power companies who have several mills, and they can tax municipalities whose domestic water supplies are improved. They can issue bonds. Of course, there is no way to tax the Indian land. So the bill provides there shall be a mutual agreement between the Secretary of the Interior and the conservancy district. It is not organized for profit but organized simply in the interest of agriculture, and there is no stock at all.

It is just the same as the case in Ohio, I will say to the gentleman from Ohio; I think there has been some drainage conservation legislation in Ohio, which we followed when we wrote this law in the State of Minnesota.

Mr. GARD. Yes; the difference between this project and the project in Ohio is that the very large project in Ohio is paying about \$30,000,000 of its own money in the enterprise.

Mr. STEENERSON. We pay here 98½ per cent of the cost of all the improvements. These lands here have been talked about by the Interior Department and they have had two drainage surveys made in many years past, and this is the only practical plan by which they can be drained, and it is impossible to have anybody occupy these lands until they are drained. These lands are all held in common by the Indians, those that are on the Indian reservation, and it is thought desirable to have them drained before they are allotted in severalty. You can not drain them after they have been occupied.

Mr. LINTHICUM. The navigation part involves only about \$15,000?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes; \$15,000 out of \$850,000. The origin of the act was the desire to improve navigation, but it was found that the local interests contributed 98½ per cent of all the expense, one of the local interests being the Indian land, which is to contribute, according to the agreement of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. GARD. I think it should be more comprehensively considered than we can consider it on the Unanimous Consent Calendar.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. This matter has been very thoroughly thrashed out heretofore. There is only \$15,000 involved on the part of the Government out of almost a million dollars that is to be contributed by other interests, and that \$15,000, according to the United States engineers, is to be appropriated in the interest of navigation. It is worthy of that improvement. I hope the gentleman will let the bill go through.

Mr. GARD. There is no navigation there, as I understand.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Oh, yes; there is.

Mr. KNUTSON. There is navigation, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. There is some, according to the report of the engineers.

Mr. GARD. There is in time of high water.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. There is navigation there, and only \$15,000 is to be appropriated by the Federal Government out of almost a million.

Mr. KNUTSON. The products of the reservation are largely taken to market on boats. Of course, there is no navigation there like that on the Ohio River or on the Mississippi River, but the navigation that is there is of great importance to these settlers.

Mr. GARD. It is stated in the report that there is 40 miles.

Mr. STEENERSON. That ought to be 71 miles, where the boats run.

Mr. GARD. This is not at all to my mind a flood-prevention project. It is a drainage project, for the benefit of lands here, some of which are in Indian reservations and some of which are outside—236,800 acres of reservation and 248,000 acres outside of the reservation.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Nearly 500,000 acres are to be drained. They are not asking the Federal Government to pay a nickel of it. They are simply asking us to give them permission to do it.

Mr. GARD. It is a drainage proposition.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. And it is a flood-control proposition.

Mr. KNUTSON. At high-flood times the Red Lake River overflows and runs into the Clearwater River, 13 miles to the south, and sometimes it is a continuous sheet of water. We are trying to have this land reclaimed and to pay for it ourselves. Only \$15,000 is to come out of the Public Treasury.

Mr. GARD. I have no desire to object to anything that will benefit the people, but my thought was that in the case of a bill of this magnitude we had better consider it under a wider scope than we can have in the discussion of a bill under unanimous consent.

Mr. STEENERSON. The gentleman will realize that it is getting late, and there was thorough discussion in the committee, in which the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS] took part.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARD. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Does the gentleman feel that it is his duty to object? Does the gentleman from Ohio contemplate objecting?

Mr. GARD. I am trying to secure information to determine whether I should object or not.

Mr. MONDELL. It is a very excellent measure, but I thought if the gentleman was proposing eventually to object, it was hardly worth while to discuss the matter further.

Mr. GARD. That is the reason why I did intend to object. It is a matter which should be brought up in another way and we should have more information on the subject.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, if I may say so to the gentleman, very extensive hearings have been held before the Flood Control Committee on this matter. The engineers of the War Department and of the Interior Department have gone into it carefully and conceded the necessity for it.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. And also the Indian council.

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; and the Indian council. They are anxious to have this work done. I hope the gentleman will not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. I object.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota moves to suspend the rules and pass the bill. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 14311) to authorize the improvement of Red Lake and Red Lake River, in the State of Minnesota, for navigation, drainage, and flood-control purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Red Lake drainage and conservancy district of the State of Minnesota, duly created and organized under the laws of said State and authorized to construct improvements and projects therein, is hereby authorized to deepen, widen, and straighten the said Red Lake River and tributaries thereof, or any portion thereof, as may be deemed necessary, and to fix and regulate the height of water in Red Lake, and to construct and maintain such ditches, drains, dams, dikes, spillways, or other controlling works as may be found necessary and advisable to utilize the said Red Lake for reservoir and flood-control purposes, and to facilitate drainage into said lake and river, as indicated and outlined in the report of the preliminary survey of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to the Secretary of War on March 28, 1919 (H. Doc. No. 61, 66th Cong., 1st sess.), with such modifications and changes as may be found advisable: *Provided*, That detailed plans for such work and improvements shall first be submitted to and approved by the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers in accordance with the act to regulate construction of dams across navigable waters, approved June 23, 1910: *Provided further*, That the deepening, widening, and straightening of that part of Red Lake River within the Red Lake Indian Reservation and all other work necessary or desirable to be done within the Red Lake Indian Reservation shall be done in accordance with plans submitted to and approved by the Secretary of the Interior, provided that due compensation shall be made to the Indians for any lands that may be required for straightening said river: *And provided further*, That before the acceptance of the plans the Red Lake Drainage and Conservancy Board and the Secretary of the Interior shall ascertain and agree upon the maximum and minimum levels between which the water in Red Lake shall be permitted to be fluctuated, and such levels shall not be deviated from without the consent of the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to enter into such contract arrangements as may be found necessary and advisable with the said Red Lake drainage and conservancy district relative to all work within the Red Lake Indian Reservation as contemplated in section 1 of this act and as to the assessment of lands within the limits of the Red Lake Indian Reservation in said State for their proportionate share of the cost of such improvement and their maintenance and operation. The said Red Lake drainage and conservancy district is hereby authorized to include within the boundary of the said drainage and conservancy district all lands within the limits of the said Red Lake Indian Reservation located within the Red Lake River drainage basin, and to assess the lands benefited in the same manner and proportion as other lands outside of the limits of said reservation, but within the said drainage district and benefited by such improvement: *Provided*, That all such assessments within the limits of said district shall be on a per acre basis against the lands benefited in proportion to the benefits received: *Provided further*, That the maximum cost to any lands within the boundaries of said reservation shall not exceed \$2.50 per acre. All assessments so levied by said drainage and conservancy district shall be in the manner provided by the laws of said State, except as modified by contract with the Secretary of the

Interior, and the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to make such regulations for the payment thereof as may be found necessary or desirable. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, a sum sufficient to pay the share of the United States as shown by said report, and to pay that part of the cost of said improvements apportioned to the lands within the said Red Lake Indian Reservation, which latter amount shall be reimbursable to the United States under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe: *And provided further*, That the assessment against the lands within the Red Lake Indian Reservation shall become a first lien on said lands and such lien shall be recited in any trust or fee patent that may be issued thereafter, and any such lien shall be enforceable by the Secretary of the Interior by foreclosure as a mortgage as soon as fee simple patent is issued: *And provided further*, That any fund standing to the credit of any Indian allottee, or which may hereafter be placed to his or her credit, may be used in payment of such lien.

Sec. 3. That wherever it is deemed necessary or advisable, roads suitable for post roads may be constructed out of the spoil banks or other suitable material along any of the drainage ditches or canals to be constructed hereunder.

Sec. 4. That as to all lands outside of the Red Lake Indian Reservation, the act entitled "An act to authorize the drainage of certain lands in the State of Minnesota," approved May 20, 1908, shall be applicable to the enforcement and collection of all assessments made for such improvements by said drainage and conservancy district.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas demands a second.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota has 20 minutes and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] has 20 minutes.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I have already explained the proposition in answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD], and I will only add now that the engineers, both those of the Federal Government and the State of Minnesota drainage engineers, have all pronounced this project as the most feasible project of reclamation of land that has ever been found in the United States.

The cost in proportion to the area benefited is very slight, and by looking at the map you can see why that is true. The water area of upper and lower Red Lake is 441 miles, but the drainage watershed basin of that lake is something like 2,000 miles. In the spring of the year the water coming into the lake rises high, but the river, which is the outlet of the lake, has a fall of only 5 inches to the mile as far as the boundary of the Red Lake Reservation, which is 15 miles west of the lake. From there down the land is privately owned. The river continues for some 8 or 10 miles more with this very little fall and low banks. When the lake is high, the land on each side of the river is overflowed, so that it is impossible to cultivate it in its natural state. As my colleague [Mr. KNUTSON] has stated, it gets so high in the spring that the water flows down through this river to the south, and for miles on each side the country becomes a lake.

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman show me on the map where Highlanding is?

Mr. STEENERSON. Here it is. About 12 miles west of the west line of the reservation. Farther down the banks of the river are higher and the fall greater.

In order to accomplish this reclamation it is necessary to build controlling works at the outlet of the lake and straighten and deepen the river through this 15 miles of Indian land and 12 or 15 miles of privately owned land. That will give this Indian land a proper flood outlet, as well as help the farmers and settlers who also suffer from flood water every spring. It will help them by having the river straightened and deepened so as to carry off the water and furnish a proper outlet for ditches.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MADDEN). Does the gentleman from Minnesota yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. The plan includes the Red Lake Indian Reservation, does it not?

Mr. STEENERSON. It includes the Red Lake Indian Reservation, but the drainage conservation district under the law will simply make the same assessment on that land as on the privately owned land, and that will not be a valid assessment or apportionment of the cost until it is approved by the Secretary of the Interior on behalf of the Indians.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I understand the cost will be about \$236,000, to be paid from the tribal funds of the Indians.

Mr. STEENERSON. It should not exceed that. That is the estimate of the War Department engineers.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. One more question. The gentleman knows well from the hearings we have held that in 1889 an act was passed by Congress for the allotment of the lands in this Red Lake Indian Reservation. That allotment has never been accomplished in spite of the fact that the Indian Affairs Committee has been trying to get the allotments made. Does the gentleman think the passage of this measure will expedite the allotment of these lands so that the Indians will be finally removed from the care of the Government and become self-sustaining?

Mr. STEENERSON. It certainly will, for this reason, that, as stated by an official of the Indian Department before the committee in my presence, it has been impracticable to make allotments to the Red Lake Indians because these lands in their present state are not fit for cultivation, and the other lands on the reservation are pine-timber lands, some of them worth \$15,000 or \$20,000 per quarter, and some of them worth \$1,000 per quarter for the timber, and if you allot them you will have the same injustice as you had on the White Earth Reservation. They do not want to allot the timberlands. They want the timber cut according to forestry practice and the money divided equitably, and they want to allot these lands to the Indians as soon as they are fit for cultivation. They have no land now that is fit for cultivation, except the few places along the shore of the lake. So this will expedite allotment to the Indians.

Mr. BEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. BEE. I notice on page 4 it is provided that there is appropriated out of any money in the Treasury a sum sufficient to pay the share of the United States. Has that share been definitely settled?

Mr. STEENERSON. It has been settled in this way: The origin of this project was a clause in the river and harbor bill of 1916 authorizing a survey of the Red Lake River with a view to improving navigation, and they were to take into consideration local interests, and they said that local interests should contribute all except \$15,000, which is the amount they state ought to be apportioned to the United States on account of improving the navigation. The clause reads:

Red Lake, Minn., and Red Lake River from its outlet at Red Lake to its junction with the Red River of the North at Grand Forks, N. Dak., with a view to devising plans for regulating works whereby the level of said lake and the flow of said stream may be controlled in the interest of navigation, and in making such examination and survey any proposition by local interests for participation in the expense of said project shall be taken into consideration.

Mr. BEE. Will any navigation result from this?

Mr. STEENERSON. Oh, certainly.

Mr. BEE. If they are willing to put up all the money except \$15,000, why do they not put up the \$15,000 and let the Government out of it, so far as any appropriation is concerned?

Mr. STEENERSON. You can not make this improvement and carry out this project without the consent of the United States. This is a navigable river. It is navigated to-day.

Mr. BEE. You can get that consent without appropriating any money for it, can you not?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes; but the United States engineer said the amount that ought to be paid by the United States was estimated at \$15,000.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. If the gentleman will allow me, why should not the Federal Government pay its share of \$15,000 if the interests of navigation justify it and the report of the engineers says that that is the fact? These people there are going to put up \$800,000. Now, the amount which the Government of the United States should pay in the interest of navigation is \$15,000. Everywhere else the Government contributes for the interest of navigation. There is navigation there and it is worth \$15,000. Why should not the Federal Government pay it?

Mr. BEE. That is argumentative, on the question as to whether or not there is a benefit to navigation.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. The engineers in their report say so.

Mr. BEE. Unless I misread the report, you take \$236,000 from the Indians?

Mr. STEENERSON. No.

Mr. BEE. From the Indian reservation. In other words, they estimate that it is going to cost \$779,000.

Mr. STEENERSON. The gentleman is reading from the report on the bill which says this preliminary survey of the War Department engineers estimated that the portion allotted to the Indian lands as benefits to them would be so much, and the portion allotted to the privately owned lands would probably be so much. But that is not final or conclusive.

Mr. BEE. How much is this thing going to cost?

Mr. STEENERSON. The War Department engineers estimate \$800,000.

Mr. BEE. Is it proposed to make the Indian tribes pay a proportion of that?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes; the same as the privately owned lands.

Mr. BEE. What benefit will the Indian tribes get out of it?

Mr. STEENERSON. Oh, they get the benefit of it. They are getting this land drained, and they never could get an allotment; they could not do anything before.

Mr. BEE. I see in the report that it is a municipal corporation and is authorized to do this.

Mr. STEENERSON. It is organized for the purpose of carrying on this work, without any profit or capital stock. It is organized to reclaim these lands so as to make them useful.

Mr. BEE. I have no especial objection to this matter, but I do want to understand from some source how it is that every time we come here something is taken away from these poor Indians.

Mr. STEENERSON. The gentleman is entirely mistaken about that. There is nothing to be taken away from these Indians. I am their very best friend.

Mr. BEE. I do not mean in this particular instance, but I am talking generally.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. The Indian council asked for this.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, this simply provides, as I understand it, for the diking of this river and for protecting these lands which the water now overflows, and most of those lands I understand to be Indian lands.

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes; there are 236,000 acres of them.

Mr. BEE. Why should it be charged to the Indians, when this is being done?

Mr. KNUTSON. If I may make this observation to the gentleman, the Indian lands that we are seeking to reclaim at the present time are worth not to exceed three or four dollars an acre. I think that would be a very liberal estimate.

Mr. STEENERSON. They are not worth anything.

Mr. KNUTSON. We claim that these lands will be worth from \$20 to \$50 an acre after this reclamation project is put through, and that increase in value accrues to the Indians and no one else.

Mr. BEE. Is it the purpose to compel the Indians to sell these lands after they are benefited?

Mr. KNUTSON. He is going to hold them; we are going to put the Indians on them and make them self-sustaining citizens.

Mr. BEE. If the lands are to be worth \$20 an acre after they are reclaimed, how much is it going to cost the Indian to reclaim them?

Mr. KNUTSON. About a dollar an acre. Two hundred and thirty-six thousand dollars is the amount.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my friend from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], the distinguished Republican whip, for in so short a time gaining enough power in the House to get a bill of this character by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], who happens to be the distinguished Acting Speaker of the House at the present time. The gentleman from Illinois, as has been shown heretofore, from his presiding position at the head of the steering committee of the House, sent out his decree all over the United States that Congressmen west of the Mississippi and south of the Ohio River should not have any more rights in this House from now on, and yet the distinguished whip—

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. GARRETT. The statement that I saw was that in the next Congress they would not have any rights.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, the gentleman knows how this steering committee arrogates unto itself power even before it is time. It is attempted even before the new Congress is to meet, on the 4th of April next.

Mr. GARRETT. It just occurred to me that perhaps that is why they are hurrying this bill through. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. That is exactly why they are hurrying it through at this time, and although the distinguished Member from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], who deservedly happens to be the majority whip, has been here only about four years, yet he has been able to put it over an old stage horse like the distinguished member of the steering committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], the man who gave out this edict, and although the bill involves the financial expenditure of \$779,000, yet the Republican whip has so arranged matters as to get the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] out of the way by having him taken off the floor and put into the chair. [Laughter.] If I had not demanded a second, the

bill would have been railroaded through here by unanimous consent and passed with about 30 or 40 Members on the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Oh, there are more than that here.

Mr. BLANTON. That was about the number when the bill was called up. Of course all of this \$779,000 does not come out of the Public Treasury, thank the Lord. Part of it comes from individuals. But I call attention to this fact, that in addition to the \$15,000 that comes out of the Treasury first-hand, there is the sum of \$236,000 also that comes out of the Public Treasury and may go back and be reimbursed, or it may not be, according to the success of this undertaking. Not all such undertakings are successful, even among financiers. Financial enterprises of this character, involving even more than \$779,000, are failures sometimes.

I am not objecting to the gentleman's bill. I expect to vote for it. I expect to help pass it, because I think it is a good proposition. I endeavored to get myself into the mood where I would be in favor of the bill, not because of hearing the argument of the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON], as he did not convince me by his argument.

However, he showed me that it would benefit the Indian, and I am going to vote for it because the Indian is supposed to get some benefit from it. The reason I am taking up the time of the House now is to protest against this kind of procedure, which passes legislation involving \$779,000 by acclamation on a suspension day with only a handful of Members present.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Does not the gentleman think he ought to be fair to the House and state more accurately how many Members are present? Anyone can see that there are nearly 100 Members on the floor rather than 30 or 40.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, as soon as I began my castigation of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] everyone was interested in it, and they all came in from the corridors. [Laughter.] Whenever you can castigate the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], who made the statement to which I have referred—and he has never denied it—everyone is interested in it, because there are a good many of us living west of the Mississippi and south of the Ohio Rivers, and we are interested in his edicts; therefore we have an audience.

I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD].

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I want to know if the gentleman from Texas was interested in having the gentleman from Illinois made Speaker pro tempore so that he could castigate him?

Mr. BLANTON. Anything on earth that would take the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] off the floor of the House I am always interested in, so that we fellows west of the Mississippi and south of the Ohio Rivers may have a chance.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask the indulgence of the House if I discuss the provision under consideration; therefore I am compelled to ask questions of the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. STEENERSON, or the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. KNUTSON, because I do not desire to impede a meritorious bill, if it be meritorious. The bill, as I understand it, provides for the expenditure of some \$779,000, of which a small percentage, \$11,000, is said to be for the governmental value of the increase in navigation and of \$256,000 for Indian lands. Now, the project is for the protection of a river which is called the Red Lake River; is that the name?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. GARD. What I want to know is whether the river flows into Red Lake—is that the flow of the river?

Mr. STEENERSON. No; it is the outlet of Red Lake, as the gentleman sees it here [pointing to a map]. See this red spot? There is another river that joins it and it goes to Grand Forks, N. Dak.

Mr. GARD. The river flows from Red Lake?

Mr. STEENERSON. Flows from Red Lake and is a tributary of the Hudson Bay watershed of the Red River of the North, which flows into Hudson Bay.

Mr. GARD. And immediately adjacent to Red Lake there is an Indian reservation?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes; it is marked here on the map; it surrounds the lake on three sides.

Mr. GARD. On the southern part of the river there are lands outside of the reservation, some 248,500 acres, privately owned. Is that correct?

Mr. STEENERSON. Westerly of the reservation. The first 15 miles west of the lake is the Indian lands.

Mr. GARD. The Secretary of War states that the department was only interested in section 1 of the bill, and stated that the

bill was primarily for the purpose of drainage of land and reclamation, and incidentally for the better utilization of the waters of these streams for sanitary, domestic, and transportation services.

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. GARD. Of course, the transportation purpose is only incidental in a very limited sense, as the gentleman was frank enough to say.

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes; but the estimate on the part of the war engineer was that the domestic water supply should contribute and the water-power interest should contribute \$240,000.

Mr. GARD. The project is one which seems to me to be twofold in its benefits, and I am not criticizing the benefits, but one project is for the benefit of the land, draining the land, and the other is the increase of the water power.

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes; the increase in the water power is assessed so as to help pay for the drainage of the farmers' land. It is proposed to assess the land that is estimated there to be allocable to the water power, so as to help pay for the whole project.

Mr. GARD. There is always a distinction, as I view it, in conservancy that has to do with the protection of land and water power, which has somewhat to do, not with the protection of the land, but with the use of power in a river or lake or some water power for the purpose of developing hydraulic power. The terms "conservancy" in water power are not the same; in fact, very often very distinct one from the other, because at times the proper use of conservancy prohibits the use of water power. I notice the report states that the carrying out of this project is feasible only through the cooperation of the State authorities having the authority to exercise the right of eminent domain and taxation. It is, as the gentleman states, only exceedingly incidental in so far as the Government obtaining navigation or flood control is concerned. It states that these authorities can not carry out the improvement because it involves the erection of controlling works at the outlet of the lake, to control the level and the outflow and the straightening and deepening of the river not only for the 15 miles within the reservation, but for 10 miles farther to the west beyond the reservation line. So I would like to have the gentleman, in my time, for the information of the committee—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. GARD. I would like to have the gentleman, either in my time, or preferably in the time which he has in his control, inform the House what will be the character of the erections at the outlet of the lake to control the level and outflow; what opportunity they have there to benefit the land and incidentally to benefit the other projects.

Mr. STEENERSON. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that these figures he cited are simply the estimates of the preliminary survey of the War Department engineers.

Mr. GARD. I know that. That is why some of us have to ask these questions, because the estimate is made here of \$779,000, and it is exceedingly probable we will have to double that amount in the expenditure before we get through.

Mr. STEENERSON. Well, that would not be a calamity if it is necessary to improve these lands.

Mr. GARD. No; it would not be a calamity, but it would be well to explain it so that we can understand it.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield for a minute?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANNON. I want to ask the gentleman from Minnesota what the expense in the end will be to the United States Treasury?

Mr. STEENERSON. Fifteen thousand dollars is estimated, and this bill authorizes an appropriation of that amount, but if the Committee on Appropriations does not see fit to appropriate, they do not have to. It amounts to less than 2 per cent—about 1½ per cent—of the total cost of the project.

Mr. CANNON. There is no chance of this legislation going to the Treasury beyond \$15,000?

Mr. STEENERSON. No, sir.

Mr. CANNON. I am from Illinois. We formed drainage districts, and the lands that we drained and that were of negligible value are now worth from \$100 to \$500 an acre. But am I right in supposing that along this river and in the Indian reservation the drainage districts would be formed and a pretty large area would pay for this district?

Mr. STEENERSON. A pretty large area.

Mr. CANNON. Is there authority to issue bonds?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. In the bill?

Mr. STEENERSON. No; in the drainage and conservancy district. It is organized under the laws of Minnesota. They finance the project.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman is right in his statement, why, I will say that I believe in drainage; but I do not believe in taxing the Treasury of the United States under existing conditions, reimbursable to all this, that, and the other.

Mr. STEENERSON. I am glad to mention that also.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] has expired.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to make an explanation.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman can do it in his own time. I want to state to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] that, in addition to the \$15,000 under this bill, the Government will advance the \$236,000 for the Indians, to be reimbursed to the Government by them if the plan succeeds.

Mr. KNUTSON. If the gentleman will please permit an interruption—

Mr. BLANTON. In just a moment.

Mr. KNUTSON. Would not the gentleman allow a correction to be made? I am sure the gentleman does not wish to be unfair.

Mr. BLANTON. I yield five minutes to my colleague from Texas [Mr. BLACK].

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask the gentleman from Minnesota a question about the clause which provides that certain funds expended by the United States shall be reimbursable. The bill says that the amount we expend on this Red Lake Indian Reservation shall be reimbursable to the United States under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe. Now, it does not say out of what funds the reimbursement shall be made, and I call attention to the fact that the usual language carried in the Indian appropriation bill for similar appropriations as this is that it is to be reimbursable from any funds of the Indians on said reservation now or hereafter deposited in the Treasury of the United States. The bill that we are now considering just merely states that the amount shall be reimbursable to the United States, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe. Now, I understand, of course, that it is expected that this amount will be reimbursed out of the funds of these Indians who live on the Red Lake Reservation, but does the gentleman think that the language is sufficient to make that absolutely clear, so that there would be no mistake about the construction?

Mr. STEENERSON. I discussed it with the Secretary's office after the bill had been reported, as to whether it would be necessary to put in an amendment. Somebody had suggested to me the same objection. But the officials there said this was sufficient, and they further informed me that under the contract for the cutting of timber that had been completed this winter there is \$500,000 in the Treasury belonging to the Red Lake Indians. It is not necessary to take that much money at once. The conservancy district will issue bonds.

Mr. BLACK. I wanted to be certain that the language was sufficient to insure that the Government would be reimbursed out of the funds of these Indians. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman states he has already taken the matter up with the Department of the Interior and has received their construction of the language, I think we may safely rely that the appropriation will be reimbursable.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a question, if the gentleman will allow me. This money would come out of the Treasury in the first instance. My attention has been called to the fact that the Treasury finances the Indians for three-quarters of a million dollars.

Mr. BLANTON. Two hundred and thirty-six thousand dollars.

Mr. STEENERSON. The money will not be wanted for two or three years. It has to be paid as the work progresses.

Mr. CANNON. I know. But could we not give authority to put this under the Legislature of Minnesota, and let them issue bonds and raise the money?

Mr. STEENERSON. Has the gentleman again finished?

Mr. CANNON. Precisely. What I object to is putting \$236,000 out of the Treasury. You have got enough of a load to carry without doing anything like that.

Mr. STEENERSON. There is no danger. I want to read the report of the War Department on the method by which this project shall be carried out. The district engineer says:

In my opinion the project is worthy of adoption by the United States to the extent of \$15,000 for supervision during its execution and \$200 annually thereafter. The work of improvement can best be financed and accomplished by the formation of a drainage district under existing and pending drainage laws of the State of Minnesota.

The laws were framed with this in view, and this simply authorizes; it does not take a dollar out of the Treasury, but it authorizes the appropriation to be made, and by that time, if the money is on hand sufficient to pay it—

Mr. CANNON. There is no objection to the \$15,000.

Mr. STEENERSON. I mean the \$236,000. This authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to reimburse the Treasury in such manner as he may require, and if he has the funds of the Indians he can do it immediately.

Mr. CANNON. Why not authorize him to take the money?

Mr. STEENERSON. We did not have the money on hand. That money came in lately. By reason of the contracts with lumber companies, they have sold a lot of timber.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Minnesota yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. How many acres of Indian land are affected here?

Mr. STEENERSON. Two hundred and thirty-six thousand acres.

Mr. HASTINGS. And how much of white men's land?

Mr. STEENERSON. Two hundred and forty-eight thousand acres.

Mr. HASTINGS. And this is proposed to be made a charge against the Indian lands, to be reimbursed to the Government?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. I just want to take a minute of the gentleman's time, if I may, to say that I have no objection to it, because I think it will improve the value of the land; but I want to call the attention of the House, and also that of the very alert chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, to the fact that in my judgment this bill, inasmuch as it affects Indian lands and Indian money, ought to have gone to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ought to have been reported by that committee, although I raised no objection myself.

Mr. STEENERSON. I will say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that this measure originated in the river and harbor bill for the improvement of the navigation. It was said that the improvement of the navigation was proper, and it was recommended that the local interests should contribute to it. It turned out that the local interests, including the lands to be drained, carried 98½ per cent of the appropriation. Still the jurisdiction went to the Committee on Flood Control.

I will say, further, that 10 years ago I introduced a bill for a drainage survey of the reservation. The Indian Committee approved it, and it was made a part of the Indian appropriation bill, and later on we had another survey of these very locks and dams, so that the Indian Committee has recommended the legislation for the drainage of this reservation.

Mr. HASTINGS. Has the Interior Department reported favorably upon this project?

Mr. STEENERSON. They certainly did, and two successive surveys by the drainage department have been made, and the project has been favorably recommended. The Interior Department is in favor of it.

Mr. HASTINGS. The letter of the Interior Department does not accompany this bill.

Mr. STEENERSON. The letter of the Interior Department, as I explained to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD], was not in the committee room, but I have a photostatic copy of it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Minnesota to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that two-thirds having voted in the affirmative, the rules were suspended, and the bill was passed.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, would it be out of order to show that the bill was passed unanimously? There was no vote against it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next bill.

CLAIMS OF BANDS OR TRIBES OF INDIANS IN CALIFORNIA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 12788) authorizing any tribes or bands of Indians of California to submit claims to the Court of Claims.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. CANNON. I object. I did object heretofore, on full examination, and I object again.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is made. The Clerk will report the next bill.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. CANNON. I will yield, out of courtesy to the gentleman; but I am going to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next bill.

MILK RIVER VALLEY GUN CLUB.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 793) authorizing the issuance of patent to the Milk River Valley Gun Club.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BEE. Reserving the right to object, is the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. VAILE] here? I do not know that I have any objection to this bill, but I am curious to know what the Congress of the United States has to do with the issuance of a patent to the Milk River Valley Gun Club.

Mr. VAILE. I will say to the gentleman from Texas that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. RIDDICK] is the author of this bill, and will be able to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. BEE. Does the gentleman mean that the Milk River Valley Gun Club is the owner of real estate, and that this is a land patent?

Mr. RIDDICK. The Milk River Valley Gun Club would own real estate if this bill were passed. I will say to the gentleman for his information that this region referred to is a marsh where game birds gather and breed. In order to enforce the game laws the gentlemen of the gun club want to protect this land and keep poachers away and protect the game in that northern part of the State.

Mr. BEE. I still do not understand. You propose through the Committee on Public Lands to authorize the issuance of a patent to this gun club to land where the game birds propagate?

Mr. RIDDICK. Yes; when this club pays the price, \$1.25 an acre.

Mr. BEE. Is it proposed to issue a patent to the gun club for the preservation of these game birds?

Mr. RIDDICK. It is proposed that a patent be issued to the Milk River Valley Gun Club for a game preserve so long as it is used for that purpose. If at any time it should not be used for that purpose, it goes back to the Government.

Mr. BEE. What is the life of the patent?

Mr. RIDDICK. The same as any patent.

Mr. VAILE. It is the same as any other land patent.

Mr. BEE. Somebody near me suggests that the life of the patent would correspond with the propagation of the birds.

Mr. VAILE. Not with the life of the bird.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. They will still propagate birds after we are dead.

Mr. BEE. I agree with the gentleman on that, but I am still a little in the dark. For the propagation of the birds, is it necessary to have a patent of this kind?

Mr. RIDDICK. There is nothing unusual about this request to have a tract of land set aside for game-breeding purposes. A group of gentlemen in Montana wish this land to be set aside, so that they can have the guardianship of it and promote the preservation and propagation of game.

Mr. BEE. Does not the Government of the United States protect these birds itself?

Mr. RIDDICK. The State laws, if enforced, would protect them except during a short season. That is just the point. These birds are not being protected. These gentlemen desire to protect the birds. Montana at one time was a great hunting State. There is danger of it losing all of its game birds and other game unless they are better protected. This is a step toward the protection of these birds.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. If my memory is correct, we have passed several bills similar to this since I have been a Member of the House, designed to protect birds and other game.

Mr. BEE. The reason I asked the question was that I was under the impression that the State itself passed laws for the protection of the birds of that State, and while I defer to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], it is a rather new proposition to me that in order to protect the birds of the State the Government of the United States would issue a patent to an association of gun-club men.

Mr. RIDDICK. The State of Montana does have laws to protect game birds, but Montana is a very large State, and the law is not enforced as well as it should be.

Mr. BEE. Does this give the members of this gun club the exclusive right to hunt upon this game preserve?

Mr. RIDDICK. There is nothing in the bill to indicate that purpose. Of course, if it is privately owned, it would be subject to any rules and regulations that this gun club may make.

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is an expert horticulturist, and he knows all about birds and bees and flowers, but I imagine he does not know very much about gun clubs.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. No; I do not.

Mr. BLANTON. My experience is that whenever a gun club protects game, it protects it for its own private, exclusive use and benefit as against the interests of the public. My colleague [Mr. BEE] asked the gentleman from Montana whether or not this gun club would have the exclusive use. The gentleman said, in reply, No; not under the terms of this bill. But under the terms of the patent, which would give them title to the property, I want to say that they could keep every single person in Montana and Colorado and every other State from having the benefit of these game birds and their protection, and their life and death, except the members of this club.

Mr. RIDDICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I will.

Mr. RIDDICK. The gentleman is right as to the rights of this gun club; but I know these gentlemen, and I know that their purpose is to protect these birds from being slaughtered indiscriminately throughout the whole year.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman from Montana and my friend from Colorado [Mr. VAILE] happened to be officers or directors of this gun club, I am sure they would not keep voters from hunting there, as long as they were Members of Congress, but after they got out of Congress they might be a little more independent. And then they might say to Tom, Dick, and Harry, who wanted to hunt the same as they do, "You must join our club before you will have the hunting privilege." Now, I do not believe in taking public land of the United States and putting it into the hands of the few as against the rights of the many.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Will the gentleman from Texas yield for a moment?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The gentleman from Texas will at once see that though a gun club may protect nesting birds in a marsh, neither that gun club nor anybody else can keep the birds from flying away from the marsh after the young birds get big enough to fly, and the gun club can not control the killing of the birds off the reservation. The main purpose of this bill, as I understand it, is to protect the birds from being destroyed while the old birds are sitting and while the young birds are being hatched out. This is a very small reservation, 70 acres, or something of that sort.

Mr. BLANTON. Has the gentleman from Illinois looked closely into the bill?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I have.

Mr. BLANTON. And he knows it to be a good bill?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I think it is a good bill.

Mr. BLANTON. For all the people of that country?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. For all the people of that country. I think it is to the interest of everybody out there.

Mr. BLANTON. Then I withdraw the objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. How much land is involved?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Less than 100 acres.

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object, the report shows that part of this reserve is in connection with the Milk River irrigation project. I should like to be advised by the gentleman from Montana, who probably has greater information than the gentleman from Colorado, what this project is. Of course, I presume the place where these ducks alight for the purpose of laying eggs and hatching them is swampy ground. I understand that as the birds fly over they stop there and hatch their eggs. Is that the purpose?

Mr. RIDDICK. This tract of 76 acres lies below a proposed irrigation ditch, and under ordinary provisions it would have to pay its share of the expense for building that ditch. This bill provides, among other things, that such part of this land as is not irrigable shall not be required to pay any portion of the irrigation expenses. It is a very fair and reasonable provision.

Mr. GARD. What I am trying to get at is this: I assume that the Milk River Valler irrigation project is now under way?

Mr. RIDDICK. Yes.

Mr. GARD. When that is completed is there going to be any place for the ducks to lay their eggs?

Mr. RIDDICK. Oh, yes; the water for this irrigation project comes from an entirely different source. This swamp will remain.

Mr. GARD. Will the land out there be still swampy?

Mr. RIDDICK. The swamp will remain. This land is of no value except as a swamp and a breeding place for birds. It is gumbo land and is a permanent swamp.

Mr. GARD. The gentleman is entirely frank to say that under the terms of the bill the undoubted purpose of the bill is, if this project is acquired and a patent given for it, that the Milk River Valley Gun Club members would be the only people allowed to hunt within these preserves of 70 acres?

Mr. RIDDICK. There is no use of questioning that purpose, but I wish the gentleman to understand that the first purpose of the gun club is not to get an exclusive place to do their shooting, but to protect the birds and to require others perhaps to join in this general effort by joining the club and protecting the game in that part of the State.

Mr. GARD. The protection, as I view it, is rather selfish protection, since the protection is only for the birds so that the members of the Milk River Valley Gun Club may in this limited territory of 76 acres have the exclusive right of killing the birds.

Mr. RIDDICK. I would not say that it is a selfish project for this reason: Under the present practice everybody who wants to go in there and kill the birds now does so. Montana being a dry State, the birds hunt these swampy places—

Mr. BEE. What does the gentleman mean by Montana being a dry State in the sense of birds? Are they migratory?

Mr. RIDDICK. Oh, I think the gentleman from Texas will not have any trouble in understanding that. These birds come in there in great quantities, and the people who live in that neighborhood hunt and destroy them out of season. The hunting season is very short in Montana. The purpose of these gentlemen is to have the birds propagate during the entire 12 months of the year and be hunted only during a restricted hunting season, a very laudable purpose.

Mr. GARD. What is this Milk River Valley Gun Club? Is it a club incorporated under the laws of Montana?

Mr. RIDDICK. It is a Montana corporation, as I understand it.

Mr. GARD. I see that the acting secretary suggests that there be placed in the bill an amendment showing where the club was incorporated, if it is incorporated. That does not appear in the bill, and I am inquiring as to where it is incorporated.

Mr. RIDDICK. I think it is incorporated at Helena, the capital of Montana.

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. VAILE] advise me if there is any such corporation?

Mr. VAILE. At the time the Public Lands Committee reported out the bill we were not advised that the club had been incorporated, and we did not insert that in the bill as it was reported. However, the club will undoubtedly take steps to be incorporated, so that the patent can be issued to a corporation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MADDEN). The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BEE. Mr. Speaker, under the further reservation of the right to object, I would ask the gentleman from Montana a question. I am rather interested in knowing why the Milk River Valley Gun Club is wishing to take out a patent on 76 acres of land in order that they may protect the game birds of that locality. I note also that in connection with the Milk River irrigation project there is a provision in the bill that the gun club shall pay the expenses for the irrigation of this area. What is the interest of the Milk River Gun Club which induces it not only to secure a patent upon the 76 acres, but also to pay the expenses of the irrigation for the Milk River irrigation project?

Mr. VAILE. The amount is 67 acres, as a matter of fact, and it lies with other lands, a great many pieces of land, under the Milk River irrigation project. The secretary wanted to be sure that when any land under that was patented the land which would be benefited by the project should pay its proportional share of the expense of the project, and that is all there is to it.

Mr. BEE. Why should the Milk River Gun Club pay the expenses of the irrigation project?

Mr. VAILE. That is not what it is doing, but if any of this land is found to be susceptible of irrigation, and, as a matter of fact, none of it will be susceptible of irrigation, the amount is to be determined by the Secretary and that land will pay its share just like any other land.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, what is the gentleman's idea about making a grant of this patent to something not in existence? There is no Milk River Valley Gun Club incorporated.

Mr. VAILE. I think the gentleman will understand that the uniform practice of the department is to issue patents only to grantees who can properly take them. A voluntary association simply would not get the patent under departmental regulations. This gun club will take the precaution, as I have no doubt it already has, to be incorporated in order to take the patent, but the committee had no fear in respect to that, know-

ing the practice of the department in that regard, and not knowing definitely that it had incorporated at the time we reported out the bill we did not insert the provision.

Mr. GARD. I am interested in the legislative aspect of granting a patent to an organization that has not been perfected.

Mr. VAILE. I do not think the gentleman need be concerned about that. That will be taken care of by the departmental regulations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to issue patent to the Milk River Valley Gun Club for lots 5 and 6 and the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 32, township 31 north, range 31 east, Montana meridian, Montana, containing 70.69 acres, upon payment of \$1.25 per acre and the further payment of \$50 per irrigable acre for the construction of irrigation works for the Milk River irrigation project, the irrigable area being fixed at 30 acres to be used for a game preserve: *Provided*, That said Milk River Valley Gun Club shall apply for patent and tender full payment within six months from the date of approval of this act: *Provided further*, That patent issued hereunder shall contain a reservation to the United States of all gas, oil, coal, and other mineral deposits that may be found in said land, and the right to the use of the land for extracting the same, and shall be subject to all rights under the T. E. Brady Canal and Bowdoin Lake Reservoir approved by the Secretary of the Interior October 25, 1901, under the act approved March 3, 1891 (26 Stat. L., p. 1095), and the patent shall also reserve to the United States right of way for canals, ditches, and telephone lines heretofore or hereafter constructed by the authority of the United States: *And provided further*, That if the land is ever used for any purpose other than that herein authorized title thereto shall revert to and vest in the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "acres," insert the words "to be used for a game preserve."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 1, strike out the word "the" and insert the words "for such."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 2, strike out the words "being fixed at 30 acres to be used for a game preserve" and insert "as may be determined by the said Secretary."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 6, strike out the words "approval of this act" and insert "such determination."

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be heard on the amendment. I would like the attention of the gentleman in charge of the bill. Apparently this amendment would not require the gun club to apply for a patent on a patent to be issued perhaps for many years in the future. I take it that was not the intent of the bill.

Mr. VAILE. No; it was expected they would apply for a patent immediately or as soon as—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The bill as originally introduced and as it stands provides that application for patent shall be made within six months from the date of the approval of the act. Now, it is proposed it shall be changed to make it within six months from the date of the determination by the Secretary of the Interior. How much of this land shall be included in the irrigation project?

Mr. VAILE. I have no doubt that could be determined right along.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That may not be done for a long time. Now, it seems to me they ought to make them apply for a patent within one year from the passage of this act.

Mr. VAILE. I would be very glad, indeed, to agree to such an amendment if the gentleman will offer it.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I offer a substitute for the committee amendment. Strike out the language "six months from the date of the approval of this act" and insert "one year from the passage of this act."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MANN of Illinois to the committee amendment: On page 2, line 5, strike out the language "six months from the date of the approval of this act" and insert in lieu thereof "one year from the passage of this act."

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Speaker, that amendment is acceptable to the author of the bill, I understand, and to the Member reporting it.

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I will.

Mr. GARD. I want to make inquiry of the gentleman from Illinois, whether his substitute strikes out the words "such determination"?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. My substitute will leave that language out of the bill.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to. The bill as amended was ordered to be read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. VAILE, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

CLAIMS OF BANDS OR TRIBES OF INDIANS IN CALIFORNIA.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BAKER. With respect to the bill H. R. 12788, just before this bill on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent, to which objection was made. I ask unanimous consent that it may remain on the calendar and go to the foot thereof.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that the bill mentioned be placed on the calendar, to go to the foot thereof. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

AUTHORIZING SALE OF GOVERNMENT EXPLORATORY WELL SITES.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 2379) to provide for the disposition of certain public lands withdrawn and improved under the provisions of the act of Congress approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. L., p. 847), as amended by the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. L., p. 497); and which are no longer needed.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman if it is his purpose to offer an amendment to this bill with reference to coal, oil, and mineral rights of the United States?

Mr. SINNOTT. I have no objection to that amendment covering mineral rights. It is a small area of land anyway.

Mr. JONES of Texas. All right.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, for the purpose of asking a question: This bill has for its purpose the sale of sites wherein the Government has made exploration for water?

Mr. SINNOTT. Where the Government has drilled for water. There is 280 acres withdrawn—

Mr. GARD. What is the idea of the proviso in line 18, page 2, that not over 100 acres shall be sold to any one person? Are exploratory sites as large as 100 acres?

Mr. SINNOTT. They have only withdrawn 280 acres so far, but I do not know how much they will withdraw in the future. In case they should withdraw more than that in one particular site—

Mr. GARD. But I am interested in knowing just about the amount of land withdrawn, of, say, one site. How much land was withdrawn for one site for exploration purposes?

Mr. SINNOTT. One contemplated sale embraces 80 acres. Only 280 acres have been withdrawn so far.

Mr. GARD. Eighty acres?

Mr. SINNOTT. Two hundred and eighty acres have been withdrawn, and they contemplate selling one 80-acre tract.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. What does the gentleman mean by withdrawn?

Mr. SINNOTT. It is withdrawn from entry for exploration for artesian water for irrigation purposes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Only 280 acres have been withdrawn for exploration by the Geological Survey?

Mr. SINNOTT. So they report.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. As I understand, the Geological Survey develops the well and finds water, and then that land and water is to be sold?

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes; to be sold.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever in the opinion of the Secretary of the Interior any lands which have been withdrawn under the provisions of the act of Congress approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. L., p. 847), as amended by the act of Congress approved August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. L., p. 497), for the purpose of exploratory drilling to discover water supplies for irrigation or other purposes, and which have had wells or other permanent improvements placed thereon by and at the expense of the United States, are no longer needed for the purpose for which they were withdrawn and improved, the Secretary of the Interior may appraise the lands, together with the improvements thereon, and thereafter sell the same to a citizen of the United States for not less than the appraised value at public auction to the highest bidder, after

giving public notice of the time and place of sale by posting upon the land and publication for not less than 30 days in a newspaper of general circulation in the vicinity of the land.

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

Page 2, line 7, after the word "same," insert the words "to a citizen of the United States."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That upon payment of the purchase price the Secretary of the Interior is authorized by appropriate patent to convey all the right, title, and interest in and to said lands to the purchaser at said sale, subject, however, to such reservations, limitations, or conditions as said Secretary may deem proper: *Provided*, That not over 160 acres shall be sold to any one person.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. JONES of Texas: Page 2, line 19, after the word "person," strike out the period, insert a comma, and add the following: "Provided further, That any patent issued hereunder shall contain a reservation to the United States of all oil, gas, coal, and other mineral rights."

Mr. SINNOTT. I do not think the gentleman wants the word "rights."

Mr. JONES of Texas. No. Strike out the word "rights."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That the moneys derived from the sale of such lands and improvements be disposed of as are other receipts from the sale and disposal of public lands.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

REFUND OF DUTIES ON FIELD KITCHENS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 6171) to authorize the refund of duties collected on field kitchens imported during the year 1916.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object, I do not see the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTON] present—

Mr. BLANTON. I object, Mr. Speaker. I objected heretofore.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

RELIEF TO PERSONS IN MILITARY TELEGRAPH CORPS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 5815) granting relief to persons who served in the Military Telegraph Corps of the Army during the Civil War.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. BLANTON. I object.

EXCHANGE OF LANDS, MONTEZUMA NATIONAL FOREST.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 8692) authorizing the exchange of lands within the Montezuma National Forest in Colorado.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and hereby is, authorized to accept on behalf of the United States title to any lands within the Montezuma National Forest in Colorado which, in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture, are chiefly valuable for national forest purposes, and in exchange therefor may give not to exceed an equal value of such national forest land or timber within the national forests of the same State as may be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture and acceptable to the owner as fair compensation, considering any reservations which either the grantor or the Government may make of timber, minerals, or easements. Timber given by the Government in such exchanges shall be cut and removed under the direction and supervision and in accordance with the requirements of the Secretary of Agriculture. Lands conveyed to the United States under this act shall, upon acceptance of title, become a part of the national forest in which they are located.

Also the following committee amendment was read:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the Secretary of the Interior be, and hereby is, authorized, in his discretion, to accept on behalf of the United States title to any land free and clear of all encumbrances within the Montezuma National Forest, or within section 23, township 37 north, range 14 west, New Mexico principal meridian, within the State of Colorado, which, in the

opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture, are chiefly valuable for national-park purposes or for the protection of stream flow, and in exchange therefor may issue patent for not to exceed an equal value of such national forest land or to exchange timber within the said national forest as may be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be of approximately equal value and acceptable to the owner or owners as fair compensation, considering any reservations which either the grantor or the Government may make of timber, minerals, or easements. Timber given by the Government in such exchanges shall be cut and removed under the direction and supervision and in accordance with the requirements of the Secretary of Agriculture, and lands conveyed by the United States under this act shall, upon acceptance thereof, become a part of the Montezuma National Forest and subject to all laws affecting national forests."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

RECLAMATION OF CERTAIN ARID LANDS, CALIFORNIA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 8864) to encourage the reclamation of certain arid lands in the State of California, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I very much regret to object to a bill the purpose of which is declared to be to encourage reclamation of arid lands. This bill is identical with an experimental measure placed upon the statute books about a year ago, applying only to the State of Nevada, as I recall, and as the measure is one which, in my opinion, is likely to be abused I do not think we should go further with this legislation until we have tried it out pretty thoroughly in Nevada.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman reserve his objection?

Mr. MONDELL. I will for a moment. I shall object, however.

Mr. RAKER. Will not the gentleman yield in order to allow an explanation?

Mr. MONDELL. I have thought the matter over carefully, and I know that legislation of this kind is subject to abuse. The gentleman from California is going to be here indefinitely, I hope, and if this plan works well in Nevada he can reintroduce the bill and urge its passage, and in the meantime we shall have tried out this experiment in Nevada.

Mr. RAKER. Now, that is just why I want to take a few minutes in order to present it to the committee.

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, I know the gentleman will say there are conditions in California that are somewhat different from those in Nevada.

Mr. RAKER. I trust the gentleman will give me at least a couple of minutes, or that the committee will, in order to call attention to the facts of this law that are within the knowledge of the introducer of this resolution, who lives adjacent to and adjoining the lands that are affected by the law as to Nevada.

Mr. MONDELL. I withhold my objection for two minutes. But I shall object.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have five minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that it is not fair to other gentlemen who have bills on the calendar to consume time when bills are to be objected to.

Mr. RAKER. Now, many of these bills might have been objected to on the same ground, but here is a meritorious bill, and the record shows and the facts on the ground show that the law is working ideally, and it has developed desert land that can not be developed otherwise.

Mr. MONDELL. No harm will be done, Mr. Speaker, if we wait a short time before we try further.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask that I may have five minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. I object.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may remain on the calendar, to go to the foot thereof.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that the bill may go to the foot of the calendar. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, I want to remark that I think the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONPELL] ought to temper his objection with patience as well as flattery.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I make the further request that I may have unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on this bill for the purpose of having the facts printed, to the end that the Members of the House may become familiar with the working of the proposed legislation in the State of Nevada before it comes up next time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on this bill. There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

ADDITIONAL POWERS AND DUTIES, MARINE HOSPITAL SERVICE.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 11841) to amend "An act granting additional quarantine power and imposing additional duties upon the Marine Hospital Service," approved February 15, 1893.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of this bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act granting additional quarantine powers and imposing additional duties upon the United States Public Health Service, approved February 15, 1893, be amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. That any vessel at any foreign port clearing or departing for any port or place in the United States or its possessions or other dependencies or any vessel at any port in the possessions or other dependencies of the United States clearing or departing for any port or place in the United States or its possessions or other dependencies, shall be required to obtain from the consul, vice consul, or other consular officer of the United States at the port of departure, or from the medical officer where such officer has been detailed by the President for that purpose, a bill of health in duplicate, in the form prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, setting forth the sanitary history and condition of said vessel, and that it has in all respects complied with the rules and regulations in such cases prescribed for securing the best sanitary condition of the said vessel, its cargo, passengers, and crew; and said consular or medical officer is required, before granting such duplicate bill of health, to be satisfied that the matters and things therein stated are true; and for his services in that behalf he shall be entitled to demand and receive such fees as shall by lawful regulation be allowed, to be accounted for as is required in other cases.

Mr. JONES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Pennsylvania: In line 3, page 1, after the word "That," insert the words "first paragraph of," so that it will read "That first paragraph of section 2 of the act," etc.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this is an illustration of how dangerous it is for a committee to accept the draft of a bill prepared by one of the departments without any examination by the committee itself.

The Public Health Service asked for the introduction of a bill to amend section 2 of a certain act, so as to read so-and-so, and it looked all right on its face, and was all right on its face. But it so happened that section 2 embraced other subjects, and the drafter of the bill in the Public Health Service did not follow out section 2 at all, but he repealed all of section 2 which was not in his draft. I do not know when it would have been discovered if I did not have a good secretary.

Mr. JONES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I discovered it when the matter was referred to me to be reported out. I noticed that it was an amendment to section 2, and I got the original act and found that only a part of the section had been amended. I took it up with the Public Health Service and asked them if that was their intention, and they said, "No." The matter was then brought to the attention of our committee, when the matter was on the calendar before an amendment was prepared to correct the mistake.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad indeed that the gentleman from Pennsylvania discovered the error. What I wonder at is that the gentleman did not correct it before the bill was reported to the House. That was the proper time to make the correction, when it was in the committee, in his hands, and not wait until it was reported to the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill as amended.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. JONES of Pennsylvania, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

NATIONAL FOREST LANDS IN SOUTH DAKOTA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 11118) authorizing the consolidation of lands in national forests in the State of South Dakota.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this bill is couched in such general language, without any limitation at all upon the power of exchange, that I am disposed to object at this time, and I do object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made. The Clerk will report the next bill.

SEQUOIA NATIONAL PARK.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 5006) to add certain lands to the Sequoia National Park, Calif., and to change the name of said park to Roosevelt national park.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will withhold his objection for a moment.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Very well.

Mr. ELSTON. I would like to recall to the gentleman's attention something that he was probably not advised about before.

I have acceded to the suggestion, first, of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS] to amend the proposed name of this park to "Roosevelt-Sequoia." The gentleman from Oklahoma indicated that he would oppose the bill unless this amendment were made; and on full consideration it was decided to make that amendment, and I am ready now to propose that amendment.

I would state further that in regard to the opposition of the Forest Service to this bill touching the boundary lines, I am prepared at this time to offer an amendment conformable to the suggestion of the Forest Service, and I am ready to incorporate in the bill the boundary lines recommended by them.

That obviates objections presented on the floor of this House many times when the bill came up previously.

I wish to say further that the suggested objections which the gentleman mentioned a moment ago to the general policy of creating additional parks are obviated in this bill. Section 3 of this bill provides that the area covered into the new park shall be subject to all the mineral-land laws and coal-land laws now applicable to the public lands. It further provides that all valid and existing locations of any kind now resting upon lands in this park shall be continued in force.

That practically reduces this proposition to a question as to whether or not the gentleman's objection lies only to the policy of adding this wild waste of mountain land to an existing park. I think he has been advised heretofore or can easily find out that this area comprises nothing but great mountain ranges, peaks, and canyons, with an average elevation of between 9,000 and 15,000 feet, and that there is practically no land in the territory to be added to the park that is usable for commercial purposes.

I would further state that, in regard even to the use of the waters in this additional area, that subject is covered by the water power act, and all those waters are now available for use under the administration of the Water Power Commission. I hope that this statement will satisfy the gentleman that all his basic objections to this bill have been met. Unless he is opposed to the general proposition of adding a new wonderland of Alpine scenery to an existing park he should permit this bill to be considered at this time.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, if this bill were enacted, I should insist on a change in the name of the park to Roosevelt National Park, and I am surprised that the gentleman from California [Mr. ELSTON] would be willing to accept an amendment which would eliminate the proposition to change the name to the Roosevelt National Park.

Mr. ELSTON. It does not eliminate the name. The amended name will be Roosevelt-Sequoia National Park.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. But, on general principles, I am opposed to tying up in a national park any public lands which might be used for the conservation of water for irrigation purposes or might be used for the development of water power; and I therefore object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made. The Clerk will report the next bill.

ABANDONED RAILROAD RIGHTS OF WAY.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 9899) to provide for the disposition of abandoned portions of rights of way granted to railroad companies.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio objects. The Clerk will report the next bill.

VALIDATION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LAND APPLICATIONS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 3994) validating certain applications for and entries of public lands, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The bill was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to issue patents upon the entries hereinafter named upon which proof of compliance with law has been filed:

Adjoining farm homestead entry, Eureka, Calif., No. 02188, made by Warren Henry Leach on February 19, 1914, for a tract of land containing 137.77 acres, described by metes and bounds, within sections 2 and 35, townships 30 and 31 north, range 11 west, Mount Diablo meridian.

Homestead entry, Timber Lake, S. Dak., No. 05023, made by Andrew W. Strommer on March 27, 1911, for the northeast quarter of section 9, township 12 north, range 19 east, Black Hills meridian, such patent to be issued to Charlotte Strommer.

Homestead entry, Glasgow, Mont., No. 036403, made by Elizabeth H. Boucher on June 7, 1916, under the acts of May 30, 1908 (35 Stats. L., p. 558), and February 19, 1909 (35 Stats. L., p. 639), for the southeast quarter of section 15 and southwest quarter of section 14, township 31 north, range 46 east, Montana principal meridian.

Sec. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to issue patent to the party named, and for the lands described, as follows:

Robert W. Stroud, for the southwest quarter of the northwest quarter, section 26, township 151 north, range 103 west, fifth principal meridian, in the State of North Dakota, upon the payment of \$1.25 per acre within six months after the approval of this act.

Sec. 3. That the entries hereinafter named be, and the same are hereby, validated, and the Secretary of the Interior authorized to issue patents thereon upon submission of satisfactory proof of compliance with the laws under which such entries were allowed:

Additional homestead entry, Helena, Mont., No. 017219, made by Charlotte Daniels, widow of Hugo Peter Weirig, deceased, on April 16, 1918, under section 7 of the act of July 3, 1916 (39 Stat. L., p. 344), for lots 4 and 5, section 3, township 8 north, range 1 west, Montana principal meridian.

Homestead entry, Miles City, Mont., No. 036842, made by Benjamin B. Gross on March 14, 1917, under the act of February 19, 1909 (35 Stat. L., p. 639), for the north half of the north half, section 32, northeast quarter of the northeast quarter, section 31, south half of the southwest quarter and northwest quarter of the southwest quarter, section 29, township 2 south, range 60 east, Montana principal meridian.

Homestead entry, Glenwood Springs, Colo., No. 013234, made by Roseberry G. Ridgway on October 9, 1917, for the south half of the southeast quarter, section 32, township 10 north, range 91 west, and the northeast quarter and north half of the southeast quarter, section 5, township 9 north, range 91 west, sixth principal meridian.

Homestead entry, Glasgow, Mont., No. 048226, made by John H. Cavanaugh on July 6, 1917, under the act of February 19, 1909 (35 Stat. L., p. 639), for the east half of the northwest quarter and the west half of the northeast quarter, section 18, township 33 north, range 50 east, Montana principal meridian.

Sec. 4. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to allow the following applications to make entry:

Additional homestead application, Glasgow, Mont., No. 043452, filed by Lawrence Benson for the northeast quarter of the northwest quarter, north half of the northeast quarter and southeast quarter of the northeast quarter, section 13, township 29 north, range 41 east, Montana principal meridian.

Homestead application, Salt Lake City, Utah, No. 014998, filed by Arthur Lawrence Whitmore for the east half of the southeast quarter, northwest quarter of the southeast quarter, northeast quarter of the southwest quarter, section 32, township 11 south, range 14 east, Salt Lake meridian, effective May 29, 1915, the date filed, and that the State of Utah through its proper officers be, and it is hereby, authorized to select 160 acres of surveyed, nonmineral, unappropriated, and unreserved public land in lieu of the above-described tract.

Sec. 5. That the allotment application made by Johnny Steele (Bull) for and on behalf of his minor child, Ed Steele (Bull), under the fourth section of the act of February 8, 1887 (24 Stat. L., p. 388), as amended, for the south half of the south half, section 21, township 43 north, range 12 east, Mount Diablo meridian, be, and the same is hereby, validated: *Provided*, That such allotment is to exhaust any right in the minor when he becomes of age to make entry under the provisions of the general homestead laws.

Sec. 6. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to sell to S. S. Markley, within a period of 90 days from and after the passage of this act, at the original purchase price of \$1,800, the southeast quarter of section 2, township 3 south, range 12 west, Indian meridian, Cotton County, Okla., and issue to him a patent therefor.

Sec. 7. That Mattie R. Mayer, of Shreveport, La., be, and hereby is, authorized to enter at the minimum price of \$1.25 per acre, the north fractional half of the south half of section 21, township 17 north, range 13 west, Louisiana meridian, Caddo Parish, La., in virtue of her long settlement, bona fide title and possession, and valuable improvements thereon: *Provided*, That the entry made hereunder shall be subject to a reservation under the act of July 17, 1914, of all rights in the oil deposits that may be found therein.

Sec. 8. That the soldiers' additional homestead application No. 01693, Juneau, Alaska, filed on July 8, 1914, by Thomas H. Holland, assignee of Clark S. Bemis, for a tract of land embraced in United States survey No. 941, duly approved, containing 6.50 acres, described by metes and bounds, on which final certificate issued December 18, 1914, be, and the same is hereby, validated, and the Secretary of the Interior authorized to issue patent thereon.

Sec. 9. That the soldiers' additional homestead application No. 01694, Juneau, Alaska, filed on July 8, 1914, by Thomas H. Holland, assignee of George Fritzing, for a tract of land embraced in United States survey No. 942, containing 3.99 acres, described by metes and bounds, on which final certificate issued December 18, 1914, be, and the same is hereby, validated, and the Secretary of the Interior authorized to issue patent thereon.

Sec. 10. That upon the survey of an island, locally known as "Island Park," situated in the North Fork of Snake River in section 1, township 7 north, range 40 east, Boise meridian, Idaho, the city of St. Anthony, through its proper representative, shall have the right to purchase said island so surveyed for park and memorial purposes, for a period of 60 days after the filing of the official plat of such survey in the United States local land office, at the rate of \$1.25 per acre: *Provided*, That the island herein mentioned shall be used by the city of St. Anthony for park and memorial purposes only, and should the city abandon its use for such purposes said island shall revert to the United States: *Provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall have the effect of defeating the rights of any person or persons which may have attached to the island or any part thereof: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make all necessary rules and regulations to carry this act into effect.

The following committee amendments were severally read, considered, and agreed to:

At the end of section 1, add the following paragraph:

"Homestead entry, Sterling, Colo., No. 016335, made by Amelia P. Clark on August 14, 1911, under the act of February 19, 1909 (35 Stat. L., p. 639), for lots 6 and 7, and the east half of the southwest quarter and the southeast quarter of section 6, township 11 north, range 57 west, sixth principal meridian."

At the end of section 2, add the following paragraph:

"Jennie Dunphy Meyer for the north half of the northeast quarter and the south half of the northwest quarter of section 10, township 33 north, range 47 east, Mount Diablo base and meridian, in the county of Lander, State of Nevada, upon the payment in advance therefor to the Secretary of the Interior for the Government of the United States of the full sum of \$2.50 per acre, for such lands, which patent shall confirm the conveyance of such lands to the said Jennie Dunphy Meyer by the State of Nevada: *Provided*, That proper application for the purchase of these lands be filed hereunder in the district land office within six months from the passage of this act, and that no adverse claim thereto be officially of record as pending when the application is allowed and the sale consummated."

At the end of section 3, add the following paragraphs:

"Homestead entry, Buffalo, Wyo., No. 08829, made by Donald Thompson on October 18, 1916, for the west half of the southwest quarter, section 3, and north half of the northwest quarter, section 10, township 53 north, range 79 west, sixth principal meridian."

"Homestead entry, Durango, Colo., No. 07648, made by Mary A. Reim on May 28, 1918, for the northwest quarter of the southeast quarter, east half of the southwest quarter, southwest quarter of the southwest quarter, section 13, and west half of the northwest quarter, section 24, township 36 north, range 15 west, New Mexico principal meridian: *Provided*, That it be duly noted that this entry is made in accordance with and subject to the provisions and reservations of the act of June 22, 1910 (36 Stat. L., p. 583), as to the east half of the southwest quarter and the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 13."

"Homestead entry, Glenwood Springs, Colo., No. 014097, made by Laderia N. Lucore on May 10, 1918, under the act of February 19, 1909 (35 Stat. L., p. 639), for lots 3 and 4, section 1, and lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, and south half of the northeast quarter section 2, township 10 north, range 93 west, sixth principal meridian."

"Homestead entry 013785, Dodge City series, made by Gustavus F. Gallagher, for south half section 28, township 24 south, range 40 west of the sixth principal meridian, Kansas."

At the end of section 4, add the following paragraphs:

"Homestead application of Ralph B. Quinn, of Phoenix, Ariz., for lots 1 and 2 and the south half of the northwest quarter section 6, township 1 south, range 3 east, Gila and Salt River meridian, subject to the provisions of the act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stats., p. 398), and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto: *Provided*, That said Quinn tender a proper application therefor within 90 days from receipt of notice of the passage of this act from the register and receiver of the United States Land Office: *Provided further*, That the entryman shall not be entitled to receive water for irrigation until public announcement by the Secretary of the Interior that water is available for the irrigation of the land."

"Additional homestead application, Rapid City series 039141, to Edward E. Voedsch, embracing the east half northwest quarter section 3 and north half northeast quarter section 10, township 6 south, range 1 east, Black Hills meridian, subject to the requirements of the enlarged homestead act as to residence, cultivation, and improvement: *Provided*, That patent shall not issue for said east half of the northwest quarter section 3 until said tract shall have been duly surveyed by the Government."

"Homestead application 037866, Rapid City series, of William Holsten for the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 15, township 2 north, range 5 east, Black Hills meridian, in the State of South Dakota."

At the end of the bill add the following paragraph as section 11:

"That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, directed to change homestead entries Nos. 021565 and 021566, embracing all of section 27, township 35 north, range 80 west, sixth principal meridian, Douglas, Wyo., land district, made by Frank O. Kellman, on October 29, 1919, and November 11, 1919, respectively, and to transfer the payments made thereon to any other tract of 640 acres of land subject to entry under the said act of December 29, 1916 (39 Stats. L., p. 862), and to issue patent thereon subject to the provisions and limitations of said act without any showing of residence, cultivation, or improvement: *Provided*, That the said Kellman shall file application for said tract within 12 months from the date of the approval of this act."

Add the following as section 12:

"That the location No. 20, township 6 north, range 9 west, second prime meridian, Indiana, which has been surveyed in the name of

Thomas Johnston, as appears from the field notes of survey on file in the General Land Office, be, and the same is hereby, confirmed to the said Thomas Johnston, and the Commissioner of the General Land Office shall issue his certificate as register ex officio and cause a patent to be issued for said claim to Thomas Johnston, his heirs, assigns, and legal representatives: *Provided*, That this act and the patent which may be granted in pursuance of the same shall only operate as a relinquishment on the part of the United States, and shall in no way prejudice any valid adverse right, if such exist, to the said land, the intent being that title shall issue to the true owners of the land under the laws of Indiana, including laws of limitation and prescription, as though patent had issued during the lifetime of said Thomas Johnston."

The following committee amendment was read:

After section 12 insert the following:

"Sec. 13. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amounts paid as fees, commissions, and purchase moneys by the persons herein-after named, in connection with homestead entries at the United States land office at Glasgow, Mont., in the year 1917, as follows:

"Serial No. 044427, Nick Stitch, west half southeast quarter, section 27, and west half of northeast quarter, section 34, township 29 north, range 41 east.

"Serial No. 044521, Billie H. Evashanks, south half southeast quarter, northwest quarter southeast quarter, section 34, township 29 north, range 41 east; and west half east half, northeast quarter southwest quarter, section 1, township 28 north, range 41 east.

"That upon receipt of the certificate from the Secretary of the Interior as provided in section 1 of this act the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to make payment of the amounts so certified out of any moneys not otherwise appropriated, and issue his warrant in settlement thereof."

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the legislation contained in section 13 has been taken care of by a Senate bill, which passed the House about two weeks ago, so it is unnecessary to adopt this amendment.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. This is a House amendment. We can vote it down.

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill add the following section:

"Sec. 14. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to issue a patent to R. L. Douglass, of Fallon, Nev., for a certain tract of land now a part of the public domain, lying below the Carson Lake meander in the unsurveyed portion of section 19, township 17 north, range 29 east, Mount Diablo meridian, in the State of Nevada, more fully described as follows: Beginning at the meander corner south of section corner common to sections 12 and 13, township 17 north, range 28 east, and sections 18 and 19, township 17 north, range 29 east, Mount Diablo meridian; hence south 9.6 chains; thence north 89° 21' east 21.9 chains; thence north 20.56 chains; thence north 73° 30' west .81 chain along Carson Lake meander; thence south 61° 30' west 24 chains to the point of beginning, containing 33.74 acres, more or less, on the express condition, however, that said R. L. Douglass shall first execute and deliver to the Secretary of the Interior a warranty deed satisfactory to such Secretary conveying to the Government of the United States, free of all encumbrance, a certain tract of land composed of portions of lots 2, 3, and 4 of section 19, township 17 north, range 29 east, Mount Diablo meridian, in the State of Nevada, more fully described as follows: Beginning at the meander corner of the section line common to sections 18 and 19, township 17 north, range 29 east, Mount Diablo meridian, running thence along the north boundary of section 19, south 89° 21' west 53.82 chains; thence south 1.34 chains to a point in the meander line of Carson Lake; thence south 73° 30' east 36.69 chains along Carson Lake meander; thence north 56° 30' east 22.41 chains to the point of beginning, containing 33.74 acres, more or less, which shall thereupon become a part of the public domain.

"That as a consideration for the issue of said patent, R. L. Douglass will construct a substantial fence around the tract of land conveyed to him under the provisions of this act."

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer an amendment to the committee amendment: On page 13, line 13, after the word "section," to strike out "14" and insert "13."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Idaho offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Page 13, line 13, after the word "section" strike out "14" and insert in lieu thereof "13."

The amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to a third reading; and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. SMITH of Idaho, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ENLISTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass House joint resolution 440, directing the Secretary of War to cease enlisting men in the Regular Army of the United States, except in the case of those men who have already served two or more enlistments therein.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California moves to suspend the rules and pass a joint resolution, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. GARD. May we have it reported in full?

The SPEAKER. It will be reported in full.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he hereby is, directed and instructed to cease enlisting men in the Regular Army of the United States until the number of enlisted men shall not exceed

175,000: *Provided, however*, That nothing contained herein shall be held to prohibit the reenlistment of those enlisted men who have had two or more enlistments and who desire to reenlist in the Regular Army.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I raise the point of no quorum present.

Mr. BLANTON. I demand a second.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. You can not demand a second after the point of no quorum present is made.

Mr. GARRETT. I withdraw the point of no quorum for a moment and demand a second.

Mr. BEE. I am opposed to this resolution, and do not want to lose any right to object to unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. This is a motion to suspend the rules. The gentleman demands a second.

Mr. KAHN. I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT. Now, Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. It is quite clear that no quorum is present. Mr. KAHN. I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll; and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Almon	Flood	Layton	Reed, W. Va.
Andrews, Md.	Fordney	Lea, Calif.	Riordan
Ayres	Foster	Lehlbach	Rodenberg
Babka	Frear	Leshner	Rowan
Baer	Gallagher	Loneragan	Rowe
Bell	Gallivan	Longworth	Rucker
Black	Ganly	McClintic	Sanders, Ind.
Blackmon	Godwin, N. C.	McCulloch	Sanford
Bland, Ind.	Goldfogle	McGlennon	Scully
Bland, Mo.	Good	McKenzie	Sells
Booher	Goodall	McKiniry	Sims
Britten	Goodwin, Ark.	McLane	Small
Brooks, Pa.	Graham, Pa.	McPherson	Smith, Ill.
Burke	Green, Iowa	Major	Smith, Mich.
Butler	Griest	Mann, S. C.	Smith, N. Y.
Caldwell	Griffin	Mansfield	Snyder
Campbell, Pa.	Hamill	Mason	Steele
Candler	Hamilton	Milligan	Stephens, Miss.
Cantrill	Hawley	Montague	Stiness
Caraway	Hill	Moon	Sullivan
Carew	Hull, Iowa	Moore	Sweet
Casey	Hull, Tenn.	Moore, Va.	Taylor, Tenn.
Classon	Humphreys	Morin	Temple
Connally	Husted	Nelson, Wis.	Thomas
Costello	Hutchinson	Nicholls	Vare
Crago	Ireland	O'Connell	Vestal
Davey	James, Mich.	Oldfield	Vinson
Davis, Minn.	Jeffers	Olney	Voigt
Dempsey	Johnson, S. Dak.	Overstreet	Volk
Dent	Johnston, N. Y.	Padgett	Walsh
Dewalt	Kelley, Mich.	Pell	Watson
Dickinson, Mo.	Kendall	Perlman	Welling
Donovan	Kennedy, Iowa	Rainey, Ala.	Welty
Dooling	Kettner	Rainey, Henry T.	Wheeler
Doughton	Kless	Rainey, John W.	Williams
Eagan	Kincheloe	Ramsey	Winslow
Edmonds	Kitchin	Randall, Calif.	Wise
Ellsworth	Kraus	Reavis	Wood, Ind.
Emerson	Kreider	Reber	
Evans, Nev.	Lampert	Reed, N. Y.	
Ferris	Larsen		

The SPEAKER. On this call 269 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] is entitled to 20 minutes and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] to 20 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FIELDS], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs, be substituted for myself in the allotment of the 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, on the 4th of June, 1920, the President of the United States approved the Army reorganization bill which allowed a total enlistment of privates in the Army of 280,000. The next day, June 5, 1920, he signed the Army appropriation bill, which provided pay and equipment for a force of only 175,000 men for this fiscal year. The Secretary of War appeared before the Committee on Military Affairs on December 10, 1920, and stated that he had gone beyond the 175,000 enlisted men, as provided in the appropriation act, because he construed the reorganization bill which provided for a total force of 280,000 men as mandatory. I called his atten-

tion to the fact that the reorganization bill of 1901, which used similar language to that used in the reorganization bill of 1920, provided for 100,000 enlisted men, but that the then Secretary of War had not attempted to enlist the total of enlisted men provided for in that law, because Congress did not appropriate for the full number. That under the Roosevelt administration only 50,000 men had been enlisted, although the law permitted 100,000. I further called his attention to the fact that in the Taft administration only about 60,000 men were enlisted at the beginning thereof, and that that number had been increased to something like 80,000 men at the time of the Mexican border trouble. The Secretary of War, however, told the committee that while he did not desire to criticize the previous administrations, yet he maintained and held that the reorganization law as we passed it was absolutely mandatory, and that it compelled him to enlist a total force of 280,000 men. The latest figures seem to indicate that about 225,000 men have been enlisted in the Army; a considerable number, about 50,000, more than the appropriation of Congress provided for. Of course, that means a very large deficit for the taxpayers of the country to pay. The present resolution would cut off all enlistments from the time it is signed until the total force is reduced to 175,000 men.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman please tell us about how much expense there is for each enlistment?

Mr. KAHN. The Secretary stated to the committee that the cost of enlisting men had been materially reduced, and that now it is about \$67 per man. He claimed that it was formerly considerably above that amount.

Mr. CRISP. What I wanted is the expense for the year of these 50,000 additional men enlisted over the amount that Congress provided for.

Mr. KAHN. Of course, the cost of enlistment is for the whole period of the enlistment, but the expenses to the Government will be largely increased, because we have to pay the wages of these men.

Mr. CRISP. That is what I was getting at—the cost to the Government of this additional enlistment.

Mr. KAHN. I think the Secretary of War has sent to the Committee on Appropriations a deficiency appropriation which amounts to something like \$70,000,000, and out of that I think about \$50,000,000 is in connection with these additional enlistments.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman be kind enough to tell the House what the cost per annum per man is?

Mr. KAHN. That varies.

Mr. MADDEN. The average.

Mr. KAHN. I think it is cut down somewhat since the war. Naturally, during the war it cost about \$2,000 per man. Since then I think the expenses have been materially reduced, and I think \$1,500 or \$1,600 per man would be the present amount.

Mr. MADDEN. I understand that it is about \$1,700 per man.

Mr. KAHN. My figures are between \$1,500 and \$1,600 per man.

Mr. MONDELL. With the singing schools and the spelling schools and the other frills and furbelows which we are now providing for the Army—the pianos and ukeles, all included—does it not cost all of \$2,000 per man now?

Mr. KAHN. I understand not.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not think the gentleman is including the ukeles and the singing schools and the singing masters.

Mr. KAHN. The gentleman is better informed about singing than I am.

Mr. BEE. Is it not a fact that we passed a bill here authorizing a maximum of 280,000 men?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. BEE. And subsequently we made an appropriation estimating the Army at 175,000 men?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. BEE. Then was not the Secretary of War within his right in following the instructions of the Congress to enlist up to 280,000 men, if he had done so, because you did not appropriate and say in your appropriation bill 175,000 men, but estimated what that would come to?

Mr. KAHN. But the debate in the House plainly indicated that it was the desire of the House and Senate, that it was the desire of Congress to reduce it in this fiscal year to 175,000.

Mr. BEE. Why did we pass a bill authorizing 280,000 men if we intended to reduce the Army?

Mr. KAHN. I did not catch that.

Mr. BEE. Why, if it was the intention of Congress to have only an Army of 175,000 men, did we authorize one of 280,000 men?

Mr. KAHN. Because we have always done that in this country, and the Secretaries before the present Secretary took the figures of appropriations made by the House as a basis for the size of the Army. The maximum figure was placed at 280,000, so that if this country should become implicated with a foreign power so that war might result the President, if he should deem the situation serious, might enlist our forces to the full number of 280,000. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I used?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has used eight minutes.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. I will.

Mr. WINGO. Am I correct in the assumption that the Judge Advocate General has held that any of its expeditionary force—that is, the drafted Army—are enlisted men, and under this resolution they would be permitted to be reenlisted because they would be called men of one or more enlistments?

Mr. KAHN. They would.

Mr. WINGO. In other words, this resolution will not bar any man who served in the Army as a drafted man from a reenlistment if he determines so to do?

Mr. KAHN. No. That is, provided he is now in the Army.

Mr. HASTINGS. That is just the question I wanted to ask the gentleman and wanted his construction on. The gentleman says there are 225,000 in the Army now?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. HASTINGS. Practically all of those over and above the 175,000 are reenlisted men.

Mr. KAHN. I have not seen the figures, but I do not think that is the case.

Mr. HASTINGS. The gentleman knows because of age they must have been reenlisted. There were about 4,000,000 in the Army. How many will this permit to be reenlisted? We could enlarge the size of the Army, it seems to me, very materially.

Mr. KAHN. Only those men who are now in the Army. Not those who have been in the Army at some time in the past, but who are now in the Army, according to the language of the resolution, could be reenlisted.

Mr. HASTINGS. Does the gentleman place that construction on the proviso?

Mr. KAHN. That was the opinion of the committee when it reported the resolution.

Mr. HASTINGS. Suppose I had been in the Regular Army and I wanted to reenlist. Could not I reenlist under this proviso so as to increase the number above 175,000?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. If the gentleman from California will permit, I think he will observe that the language of the resolution identifies the men who are to be permitted to reenlist as being now enlisted men. If the gentleman was out of the Army he would be a civilian and not an enlisted man.

Mr. KAHN. The gentleman will see, on page 1, line 8, they must be "now enlisted" men, so that I think it would exclude the men who are not now in the Army.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. I do.

Mr. BANKHEAD. How long is it estimated it would take in order that the present number of 225,000 shall be reduced by the expiration of enlistments to 175,000?

Mr. KAHN. I think it will take some months to do that—six or seven months.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Did the committee consider the advisability of bringing in a resolution to compel the discharge of the excess at the present time?

Mr. KAHN. Well, those men who are in excess have made a contract with the Government of the United States, and I do not think it is proper for the Government to violate its contracts.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. I will.

Mr. MILLER. Is it not true that the Secretary before the committee justified his action entirely upon the mandatory section of the bill and said nothing concerning world conditions?

Mr. KAHN. Exactly. How much time have I used?

The SPEAKER. Eleven minutes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. I want to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HAYDEN. I want to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. KAHN. Just one question.

Mr. HAYDEN. Will the passage of this resolution in any way interfere with the plan for universal military service, which the gentleman from California favors?

Mr. KAHN. Oh, the gentleman is asking a foolish question. The question of universal military training is not involved in the resolution at all.

Mr. HAYDEN. The gentleman from California is now presenting a resolution for a reduction in the number of enlisted men in the Army, while he favors the adoption of universal military training. Does not the gentleman think that is inconsistent—

Mr. KAHN. The gentleman from Arizona shows how little he knows about the subject. The gentleman has constantly stated that he does not favor universal military training and put the men into the Army, but the training was altogether out of the Army.

Mr. HAYDEN. Will the gentleman answer my question?

Mr. KAHN. Let the gentleman ask me some sensible question instead of such a question as that. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BEE].

Mr. BEE. Mr. Speaker, I realize how futile it is to utter a protest against this resolution. I want to say to this House that this same Congress, after an extended debate, authorized the Secretary of War to enlist to a maximum of 280,000 men. Afterwards we passed an appropriation bill that it is claimed would only bring the Army to 175,000 men.

This resolution is a direct attack upon the integrity of the action of the Secretary of War in enlisting up to 220,000 men under the mandatory authority of Congress. [Applause on the Democratic side.] In other words, my Republican friends attack a Democratic Secretary of War because he obeyed the law. The Congress of the United States authorized him to raise 280,000 men, and he went ahead under the action of Congress. Let me say to the gentlemen of this House, you are going to adopt your 175,000, or your 150,000, perhaps, when you get your lecture from the Senate, but with the Philippines, Porto Rico, Hawaii, with the unsettled conditions in Cuba, with the vast Mexican border, the internal conditions all over this country, 150,000 Regular troops are not enough, and the day will come when Members of Congress who sit here now and joyfully vote to reduce the Army of the United States will confess their complete error in this action. I realize it is futile. The cards have been laid out and the dictum has gone forth that this reduction shall be made, and the Republicans approve of it because it is criticism of the Secretary of War, whom the Congress of the United States authorized to enlist to 280,000 men. He has stated that he considered it mandatory, and I declare that the action of Congress was mandatory on him when it was made. I live on a great border that is unprotected, except in part by the Rangers of Texas, who keep that Mexican border in peace, and it is now proposed to take away from the United States any responsibility for safeguarding that border. For one, I register my protest against the passage of this resolution and raise my voice in defense of the integrity of the action of the Secretary of War.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to defend the Secretary of War when I believe that he has done wrong in overriding the express will and direction of this Congress and creating a deficiency of \$70,000,000, to be paid for by the tax-burdened people of this country. On every occasion and opportunity I have voted to decrease the size of our standing Army.

It is almost impossible now to get a man out of the Army who has dependents and who is entitled to a discharge. Only last Saturday Maj. Gilmore, in talking with my office over the phone in regard to Pvt. Abner N. Cason, Fourteenth Company, Oahu, Coast Artillery Corps, Fort Ruger, Hawaiian Territory, a man who has good reason for being discharged under the law of this country, said, "I will discharge him if he demands it, but I will discharge him about 2,000 miles away from his home, and give him a discharge that is not honorable; that will go down to his children and grandchildren; and I will make him pay his way home, a distance of about 2,000 miles." But I am also not here to defend this majority side of the House. When the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] placed upon this country a maximum limit of 280,000 men in our Army, one of his colleagues, Mr. LaGuardia, tried his best to reduce the maximum number, and each time this military machine, controlled by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN], voted him down, and put that maximum limit of 280,000 men in the bill. And he ought to shoulder some of the responsibility, inasmuch as he is just as much to blame as the Secretary of War. And in a motion to recommit the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT] sought to reduce the size of the Army, both privates and officers, and again our Republican colleagues unanimously voted against it and defeated reduction. I voted for all proposals to reduce.

Mr. FIELDS. Does the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] desire to use more time now?

Mr. KAHN. I have used 11 minutes of my time. I hope the gentleman will proceed.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN]. [Applause.]

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Speaker, I do not indorse at all what the Secretary of War has done in this matter. I did not vote for this bill to start with, because I was afraid he would do that very thing. Another reason that I would not vote for this bill was because, as I stated on the floor of this House, I understood it to be more of an officers' bill than it was anything else. There have been carried out, according to my judgment, the very objections that were raised by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT] and other gentlemen and myself against this bill. They are carrying it through. Now, so far as the Secretary of War thinking it incumbent upon him to enlist all these men, I do not take any stock in it. It is as plain as the nose on a man's face, according to the conception of his office, that the amount of money appropriated for the 175,000 soldiers was the limit for him to enlist. [Applause.] But he is attempting to enlist the full strength, and now has over 220,000. I am for reducing this Army to 150,000, and I will vote to reduce it more than that. I think 175,000 is too much. One hundred and fifty thousand, as provided in the Senate resolution which comes over to us, ought to be the number that this House will place in the Army. That would accord with my idea of it. Let the War Department know in emphatic terms and in specific language that not more than 150,000 men can be placed in the Army. Do you reckon the Secretary of War thought he would be impeached if he did not make the Army 280,000? According to the arguments made on this floor and before the committee, the 280,000 was to be the maximum number of men in the Army, and it was placed with this elastic latitude so as to be enlisted up to full strength in the event of an emergency arising, which would make that number necessary. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT]. [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I take it that the great majority of us here are now for this resolution. But I do not think it is either fair for the present or for history that the criticisms which have been made directly and by inference of the Secretary of War by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] should pass unchallenged. I congratulate gentlemen upon the Republican side of the Chamber that they have reached that point where they are willing to eat the words they spoke less than a year ago. [Applause on the Democratic side.] When the Army reorganization bill was pending, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT], the ranking member of the minority, offered a motion to recommit the bill and to expressly provide that the number of enlisted men should not at any time exceed 185,000.

Mr. DENT. One hundred and seventy-five thousand.

Mr. GARRETT. One hundred and eighty-five thousand, it says here. Also the gentleman put in that motion to recommit a proper provision for officers for an Army of that size. A yeand-nay vote was had on that question. The vote was yeas 115 in favor of the motion to recommit, and nays 222 against the motion to recommit, and all those votes against the motion to recommit, so far as I can find from a hurried examination of the roll, came from the Republican side of the Chamber. [Applause on the Democratic side.] No wonder the Secretary of War construed the language contained in the bill to be mandatory upon him, when the overwhelming majority of the House had, in the very passage of the bill itself, voted down a proposition that would have limited the number to 10,000 above that at which it is now proposed to limit it by this resolution. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Ah, gentlemen have not made provision in this bill to get rid of the surplus officers, as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT] did in his motion to recommit. You are to leave the officers that are required for an Army of 280,000, whatever that may be, and it is simply to affect the number of enlisted men under this joint resolution that it is now proposed to pass.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. I am inclined to believe that the fears of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN] were well founded when he stated on that bill, when it passed, that it was an officers' bill.

Now, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I think if the gentleman will read the text of the hearings of the Secretary of War before the Committee on Military Affairs, he will learn from them that he did not consult the debates on the floor as his authority for anything. In fact he argued to the contrary; he took the text of the bill.

Mr. GARRETT. I know. I did not say that he consulted the debates. I do not know whether he consulted the votes, but, if he did, he certainly had a right to assume from the overwhelming majority cast by the Republican side of the House that they did favor an Army of more than 185,000. I will ask my friend if that is not a fair inference?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The inference is fair, if you can base any argument on the floor of this House upon an "if." [Laughter.]

Mr. GARRETT. I am not basing my argument on an "if." I am basing it on the 222 Republican votes cast against the motion to recommit and cut the Army down to 185,000.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. If the gentleman will permit me further, I may say he has had too long experience and is too well distinguished in the House not to know that roll calls do not show the reasons for things. [Laughter.] The laughter may come from those who have found that out by experience.

Mr. GARRETT. Well, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct in part, that the votes do not always show the reasons. But this vote on this pending proposition, as it will come from the Republican side of the House, will at least show that the light has broken on that side since they cast that vote at the last session. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, how much time has the gentleman from Kentucky used?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California has eight minutes. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FIELDS] has six minutes.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Vermont is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that three minutes will not enable me to explain all that has been done in the last year. But it is the practice, and has been the practice and policy of this House back at least of the time of any man now in it, for the military law to establish a maximum for the strength of the Army and for the Army appropriation bills from year to year to indicate, by the amount appropriated for the support of the Army, something of a direction to the Secretary of War as to how many men were from year to year to be raised and maintained in that Army.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Not in three minutes, if the gentleman will permit me.

Mr. EVANS of Montana. Just for a moment.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Then, in justice to me, I must have more time. The gentleman will pardon me.

This is undisputed: Men who have stayed here year after year know that annually as the appropriation bills come up we ascertain how many men we want for the coming fiscal year, and then appropriate a sum of money to bring that about and make it possible.

It has been stated on the floor of this House times without number what the reason is for the maximum number of enlisted men provided for in the law. In an emergency, when perhaps our relations with a neighboring power are becoming somewhat delicate, the President, if afraid of some possible friction of a military character, may quietly raise his enlisted force without coming to Congress and asking for specific authority so to do, and thus perhaps avoid intensifying and increasing the irritation and alarm, because otherwise what he would be doing would look like a military threat.

That has been well understood as a part of the unwritten law and policy subsisting between the War Department and Congress for the last quarter of a century, and there has been no dispute about it until the present abuse by the Secretary of War of the authority contained in the Army reorganization act of June 4, 1920. At the time that act was debated the assurance given to the Members on the floor of this House who voted for exactly the same thing that the gentleman from Tennessee says now binds us was that we expected to regulate the size of the Army under this act by the annual appropriation made for its maintenance. Every gentleman here familiar with legislative matters or civic matters knows that there may be certain language in the text of a law and yet something less than that language may be realized in its policy of administration. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Kentucky use some of his time?

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask another foolish question. I desire to inquire of the gentleman from California, the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, whether he has abandoned his plan for universal military service, or whether this resolution will interfere with that plan? Has the gentleman changed his mind on that question as he changed it on this?

Mr. KAHN. I have not changed my mind on this matter, and I decline to change my mind regarding the action of the Secretary of War. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HAYDEN. What action was that?

Mr. KAHN. On the vote on the appropriation bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. I would like to have an answer to my question relative to universal military service, if the gentleman please.

Mr. KAHN. The gentleman has not changed his views on that question, but the gentleman is not pressing his views on this House at this time. [Laughter.]

Mr. HAYDEN. It is very evident that the gentleman is not pressing his views either at this time or at any other time, because the question of universal military service is as dead as the question of African slavery.

Mr. KAHN. Oh, the gentleman's impressions are not always correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. Then am I to understand that the gentleman from California expects to report out a bill in favor of universal military service?

Mr. KAHN. The gentleman from Arizona knows that the gentleman from California does not expect to do anything of the kind at present.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am glad to get that admission from the gentleman, and the country will be glad to hear it, because the impression has gone broadcast that the gentleman from California was so enamored of the idea of universal military service that he intended to seriously press his old proposition before the Congress. The taxpayers of the country will be greatly relieved in these days of heavy taxation to know that that burden is not to be laid upon their shoulders.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. The gentleman from California realizes that this country may be attacked at any time.

Mr. HAYDEN. Is that the reason why the gentleman favors reducing the Army as provided in this resolution? [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. KAHN. But the gentleman from California knows that if anybody does attack this country we can pass laws through Congress that will give us the army that we require to defend it. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL].

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion this resolution in its present form is pure camouflage and will not bring about the result that the House desires. I can not refrain from calling your attention to the fact that this joint resolution should prohibit a bonus being paid for reenlistments. If we are honest in trying to reduce the Army, I do not know why we permit the War Department to pay a bonus for reenlistments. I supposed that when this resolution was considered, which in reality is a resolution that I myself introduced, I would have an opportunity to offer an amendment; but I understand the motion has been brought up in such a way that I am prevented from offering an amendment prohibiting the bonus or for one-year enlistments; and I simply call attention to the fact that as long as you allow them to pay a bonus you will not reduce your Army as fast as you want to. It is dishonest to claim or pretend that you intend to have a smaller Army and in the same resolution permit the Army to pay \$90 to every man that will reenlist for three years. If you do this, and then make an appropriation for an Army of 150,000, a Republican Secretary of War will have a larger deficiency to report than is reported by the present Democratic Secretary.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand the Senate has recently passed a resolution reducing the Army to 150,000 men. What is the hurry about putting through this resolution providing for 175,000, without waiting for the Senate resolution to come over so that we can vote on that?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I know nothing at all about its being considered by the House.

Mr. ANTHONY. I understand the Senate has reconsidered that resolution.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. They are reconsidering it this afternoon. I do not know in what form it will come here, but that does not change our situation here.

Mr. KAHN. Has the gentleman on the other side used all of his time? I have only one more speech.

Mr. FIELDS. How much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. Four minutes.

Mr. FIELDS. I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT]. [Applause.]

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate my friends on the Republican side of the Chamber for their change of heart since last June, when we passed the Army reorganization bill.

Attention has been called to the fact that I offered an amendment limiting the strength of the Army. The Republican side of the House practically voted with unanimity against my motion to recommit.

I am sorry that I did not know that this resolution was to be called under a motion to suspend the rules. I should have liked to have some notice of it; not that I particularly object to the bill, because it is in consonance with my ideas on the subject.

I think an Army of 175,000 is sufficient for all purposes in this country. But the point I wish to make now, after these record facts have been called to the attention of the House, is that this bill coming up on a motion to suspend the rules is not subject to amendment. The other day in the hearings before the subcommittee on the Army bill, of which my good friend the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] is acting as chairman, we had testimony to the effect that 50,000 officers could handle 1,000,000 men; in other words, that 1 officer for every 20 men was sufficient. I called attention to that fact when we were considering the Army reorganization bill. This resolution is not subject to amendment and should not be called under suspension. We will still have 17,000 officers even if the Army should be reduced to 175,000 men.

Mr. Sisson. If the gentleman will allow me, I do not understand that this bill limits the Army to 175,000 men, because the proviso will permit every man who has had one enlistment to reenlist in the Army, and we now have 220,000.

Mr. DENT. I was coming to that proposition, and am glad my friend from Mississippi has suggested it. To-day, according to the information I have, there are 225,000 men in the Army. Under the Army reorganization bill enlistments are authorized up to 280,000 men. We have actually 225,000 men to-day. If this resolution is passed, it by no means follows that the Army will be reduced to 175,000. Enlistments are for one and three years. The contract of enlistment can not be broken, and reenlistments are permitted. The only purpose the resolution can possibly serve is to discontinue such enlistments, without necessarily reducing the size of the Army.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

Mr. FIELDS. I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California and the gentleman from Kentucky ask unanimous consent to extend their remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming is recognized for two and one-half minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, when the House of Representatives passed the current military appropriation bill it appropriated for an Army of 175,000 men. In that form it became a law. The Secretary of War, like everyone else who was informed at all on the subject, understood the will, intent, and purpose of the Congress to limit the Army to 175,000 men for the current year. Instead of abiding by and following that will and purpose, as every other Secretary of War has done since the foundation of the Government, in a spirit of pique and willfulness, and in defiance of the will of Congress, the Secretary of War has, at great expense, recruited the Army up to about 225,000 men. The gentlemen on the other side, who are squirming under this resolution, but who will vote for it, ought to be thankful that it is not a resolution of censure on the Secretary of War for his unlawful acts and his willful waste of public money. [Applause.]

The Secretary has been engaged in a work of supererogation. He has been trying to justify the judgment and decision of the American people at the last election. It was not necessary. They were fully justified before he, following the example of other officers under this administration, defiantly violated the law and flaunted the will of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Army appropriation bill, soon to be reported, will reduce the Army to be maintained the next

fiscal year below 175,000 men, but for the present we can not logically call upon the Secretary of War to stop recruiting until he shall have reduced the Army below the number of men we authorized him to enlist when we passed the Army appropriation act. We are calling on him to keep within the appropriation we have made and the number appropriated for.

Mr. Speaker, in all the history of this Government we never before have had such an example as the present Secretary of War has given us of contemptuous disregard of the will of the people of the country as expressed by their Representatives in the Congress. He has cost the people upward of fifty millions above the appropriation by enlistments which were not authorized.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired. All time has expired. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the joint resolution.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 285, nays 4, not voting 141, as follows:

YEAS—285.

Ackerman	Elston	Lankford	Romjue
Anderson	Esch	Larsen	Rose
Andrews, Nebr.	Evans, Mont.	Lazaro	Rouse
Anthony	Evans, Nebr.	Lee, Ga.	Rubey
Ashbrook	Fairfield	Linthicum	Sabath
Aswell	Fess	Little	Sanders, La.
Ayres	Fields	Longworth	Sanders, N. Y.
Bacharach	Fish	Luce	Schall
Bankhead	Fisher	Lufkin	Scott
Barbour	Flood	Luhning	Sears
Barkley	Focht	McAndrews	Sherwood
Begg	Freeman	McArthur	Shreve
Benham	French	McClintic	Siegel
Benson	Fuller	McDuffie	Sinclair
Black	Gandy	McFadden	Sinnott
Bland, Va.	Gard	McKeown	Sisson
Blanton	Garner	McKinley	Slomp
Boles	Garrett	McLaughlin, Mich.	Smith, Idaho
Bowers	Glynn	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Snell
Bowling	Goodykoontz	McLeod	Steagall
Box	Gould	MacGregor	Stedman
Brand	Graham, Ill.	Madden	Steenerson
Briggs	Greene, Mass.	Magee	Stephens, Miss.
Brinson	Greene, Vt.	Mann, Ill.	Stephens, Ohio
Brooks, Ill.	Hadley	Mapes	Stevenson
Brumbaugh	Hardy, Colo.	Martin	Stoll
Buchanan	Hardy, Tex.	Mays	Strong, Kans.
Burdick	Harrell	Mead	Strong, Pa.
Burrroughs	Harrison	Merritt	Summers, Wash.
Butler	Hastings	Michener	Summers, Tex.
Byrnes, S. C.	Haugen	Miller	Sweet
Byrns, Tenn.	Hayden	Minahan, N. J.	Swindall
Campbell, Kans.	Hays	Monahan, Wis.	Swope
Cannon	Hernandez	Mondell	Tague
Cantrill	Hersey	Moore, Ohio	Taylor, Ark.
Caraway	Hersman	Moore, Ind.	Taylor, Colo.
Carew	Hickey	Mott	Thompson
Carss	Hicks	Mudd	Tillman
Carter	Hoch	Murphy	Tilson
Chindblom	Hoe	Neely	Timberlake
Christopherson	Holland	Nelson, Mo.	Tincher
Clark, Fla.	Houghton	Newton, Minn.	Tinkham
Clark, Mo.	Howard	Newton, Mo.	Towner
Classon	Huddleston	Nolan	Treadway
Cleary	Hudspeth	O'Connor	Upshaw
Cole	Hulings	Ogden	Vaile
Collier	Hull, Iowa	Oldfield	Venable
Cooper	Hull, Tenn.	Oliver	Vestal
Copley	Humphreys	Osborne	Vinson
Crisp	Igoe	Palge	Voigt
Crowther	Jacoway	Park	Volstead
Currie, Mich.	James, Va.	Parker	Walters
Curry, Calif.	Johnson, Ky.	Parrish	Ward
Dale	Johnson, Miss.	Patterson	Wason
Dallinger	Johnson, Wash.	Peters	Watkins
Darrow	Jones, Tex.	Phelan	Weaver
Davis, Tenn.	Juul	Porter	Webster
Denison	Kahn	Purnell	Welty
Dent	Kearns	Quin	Whaley
Dickinson, Iowa	Keller	Radcliffe	White, Kans.
Dickinson, Mo.	Kelley, Mich.	Rainey, Henry T.	White, Me.
Dominick	Kelly, Pa.	Raker	Wilson, La.
Doremus	Kennedy, R. I.	Ramsey	Wilson, Pa.
Dowell	Kettner	Ramseyer	Wingo
Drane	Kless	Randall, Wis.	Woods, Va.
Drewry	King	Ransley	Wright
Dunbar	Kinkaid	Rayburn	Yates
Dunn	Klecza	Rhodes	Young, N. Dak.
Dupré	Knutson	Ricketts	Young, Tex.
Dyer	Kraus	Robinson, N. C.	
Echols	Langley	Robson, Ky.	
Elliot	Lanham	Rogers	

NAYS—4.

Bee	Blackmon	Coady	Cramton
-----	----------	-------	---------

NOT VOTING—141.

Almon	Bland, Mo.	Caldwell	Crago
Andrews, Md.	Booher	Campbell, Pa.	Cullen
Bakka	Britten	Candler	Davey
Baer	Brooks, Pa.	Casey	Davis, Minn.
Bell	Browne	Connally	Dempsey
Bland, Ind.	Burke	Costello	Dewalt

Donovan	Hutchinson	Montague	Sells
Doollig	Ireland	Moon	Sims
Doughton	James, Mich.	Mooney	Small
Eagan	Jefferis	Moore, Va.	Smith, Ill.
Eagle	Johnson, S. Dak.	Morin	Smith, Mich.
Edmonds	Johnston, N. Y.	Nelson, Wis.	Smith, N. Y.
Ellsworth	Jones, Pa.	Nicholls	Smithwick
Emerson	Kendall	O'Connell	Snyder
Evans, Nev.	Kennedy, Iowa	Olney	Steele
Ferris	Kincheloe	Overstreet	Stiness
Fordney	Kitchin	Padgett	Sullivan
Foster	Kreider	Pell	Taylor, Tenn.
Frear	Lampert	Perlman	Temple
Gallagher	Layton	Pou	Thomas
Gallivan	Lea, Calif.	Rainey, Ala.	Vare
Ganly	Lehlbach	Rainey, John W.	Volk
Godwin, N. C.	Leshner	Randall, Calif.	Walsh
Goldfogle	Lonerger	Reavis	Watson
Good	McCulloch	Reber	Wellington
Goodall	McGlennan	Reed, N. Y.	Wheeler
Goodwin, Ark.	McKenzie	Reed, W. Va.	Williams
Graham, Pa.	McKiniry	Riddick	Wilson, Ill.
Green, Iowa	McLane	Riordan	Winslow
Griest	McPherson	Rodenberg	Wise
Griffin	Maher	Rowan	Wood, Ind.
Hamill	Major	Rowe	Woodyard
Hamilton	Mann, S. C.	Rucker	Zihlman
Hawley	Mansfield	Sanders, Ind.	
Hill	Mason	Sanford	
Husted	Milligan	Scully	

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. STEELE.
 Mr. HUTCHINSON with Mr. DAVEY.
 Mr. REED of West Virginia with Mr. RANDALL of California.
 Mr. MCPHERSON with Mr. MAJOR.
 Mr. SANDERS of Indiana with Mr. GRIFFIN.
 Mr. WINSLOW with Mr. GALLIVAN.
 Mr. BLAND of Indiana with Mr. BLAND of Missouri.
 Mr. GREEN of Iowa with Mr. DONOVAN.
 Mr. GREIST with Mr. DEWALT.
 Mr. MORIN with Mr. CASEY.
 Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota with Mr. RUCKER.
 Mr. ANDREWS of Maryland with Mr. WISE.
 Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota with Mr. KITCHIN.
 Mr. LAYTON with Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas.
 Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee with Mr. MAHER.
 Mr. PERLMAN with Mr. BOOHER.
 Mr. EMERSON with Mr. CULLEN.
 Mr. REBER with Mr. NICHOLLS.
 Mr. ZIHLMAN with Mr. ALMON.
 Mr. RODENBERG with Mr. SIMS.
 Mr. WALSH with Mr. SMALL.
 Mr. MASON with Mr. FERRIS.
 Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa with Mr. EAGAN.
 Mr. BROWNE with Mr. THOMAS.
 Mr. WHEELER with Mr. LESHNER.
 Mr. FREAR with Mr. LEA of California.
 Mr. EDMONDS with Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. SCULLY with Mr. HUSTED.
 Mr. STINESS with Mr. BELL.
 Mr. HAWLEY with Mr. DOOLING.
 Mr. MCCULLOCH with Mr. BABKA.
 Mr. WOODYARD with Mr. MOONEY.
 Mr. REED of New York with Mr. CALDWELL.
 Mr. HILL with Mr. MANN of South Carolina.
 Mr. WILSON of Illinois with Mr. ROWAN.
 Mr. SELLS with Mr. CANDLER.
 Mr. GOODALL with Mr. EVANS of Nevada.
 Mr. WILLIAMS with Mr. OVERSTREET.
 Mr. WATSON with Mr. PADGETT.
 Mr. TEMPLE with Mr. EAGLE.
 Mr. COSTELLO with Mr. McLANE.
 Mr. SMITH of Illinois with Mr. HAMILL.
 Mr. IRELAND with Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY.
 Mr. VOLK with Mr. SMITHWICK.
 Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin with Mr. OLNEY.
 Mr. WOOD of Indiana with Mr. SULLIVAN.
 Mr. SNYDER with Mr. O'CONNELL.
 Mr. CRAGO with Mr. RIORDAN.
 Mr. MCKENZIE with Mr. SMITH of New York.
 Mr. VARE with Mr. WELLING.
 Mr. SANFORD with Mr. LONERGAN.
 Mr. BRITTEN with Mr. GALLAGHER.
 Mr. RIDDICK with Mr. PELL.
 Mr. REAVIS with Mr. MONTAGUE.
 Mr. FORDNEY with Mr. POU.
 Mr. LAMPERT with Mr. RAINEY of Alabama.
 Mr. FOSTER with Mr. DOUGHTON.
 Mr. GOOD with Mr. CONNOLLY.

Mr. BURKE with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.
 Mr. ELLSWORTH with Mr. MOONEY.
 Mr. KREIDER with Mr. GANLY.
 Mr. DEMPSEY with Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina.
 Mr. ROWE with Mr. MANSFIELD.
 Mr. JEFFERIS with Mr. MILLIGAN.
 Mr. JONES of Pennsylvania with Mr. KINCHELOE.
 Mr. KENDALL with Mr. JOHNSTON of New York.
 Mr. JAMES of Michigan with Mr. MCGLENNON.
 Mr. LEHLBACH with Mr. MOORE of Virginia.
 Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania with Mr. MCKINIRY.
 Mr. JONES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I desire to vote.
 The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman present and listening when his name was called?
 Mr. JONES of Pennsylvania. No; I was not in the room.
 The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not bring himself within the rule.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, Mr. LAMPERT was granted leave of absence indefinitely on account of sickness.

Mr. ALMON was granted leave of absence for one day on account of illness.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas was granted indefinite leave of absence on account of important business.

Mr. KING was granted leave of absence for the afternoon to attend the funeral at Arlington of Lieut. William M. Ferris, of Galesburg, Ill., who died in the service of his country in the late war and whose body has just been returned from France.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the joint resolution just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ROMJUE. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a statement of the farm-loan bank of Houston, Tex.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing an article on world debts and paper currency.

The SPEAKER. By the gentleman himself?

Mr. ACKERMAN. No, sir.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. What is the subject?

Mr. ACKERMAN. It is on world debts and paper currency, a very comprehensive article.

Mr. GARD. The gentleman's own article?

Mr. ACKERMAN. No, sir; it is not.

Mr. GARD. I do not desire to object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

MEMORIAL SERVICES.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a motion, to which I think there will be no objection, in reference to memorial services.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

On motion of Mr. FLOOD,
Ordered, That Sunday, February 13, 1921, at 12 o'clock noon, be set apart for addresses on the life, character, and public services of the Hon. THOMAS S. MARTIN, late a Senator from the State of Virginia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make the same motion in reference to the Hon. WALTER A. WATSON, late a Representative from the State of Virginia.

The SPEAKER. On the same day?

Mr. FLOOD. No, sir; on the 20th of February, one week later.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That Sunday, February 20, 1921, at 12 o'clock noon, be set apart for the addresses on the life, character, and public services of Hon. WALTER A. WATSON, late a Representative from the State of Virginia.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 18, 1921, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

345. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting report of rents received from properties located on sites of proposed public buildings purchased by the United States Government in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

346. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a request for the amending of House bill 15614, to authorize the President of the United States to classify and name the vessels of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

347. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Lake Butte des Morts, Wis.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

348. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting reports of Chief of Engineers, Quartermaster General, Military Academy, and Chief of Supply Division, War Department, of typewriters, adding machines, and other labor-saving devices exchanged during fiscal year 1920. Also reports of the General Staff College and the Chief Signal Officer; to the Committee on Appropriations.

349. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Black Rock Channel, N. Y. (H. Doc. No. 981); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed with illustration.

350. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting alternative estimate of appropriation required by the Postal Service for indemnities, domestic mail, fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 982); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

351. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Bureau of Standards (Department of Commerce) for "Standardization of equipment," fiscal year 1921 (H. Doc. No. 983); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 14259) for permit to construct a toll bridge across the Tennessee River, Marshall County, Ala., at a point one-half mile north of Gunterville, Ala., reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1198), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TOWNER, from the Committee on Education, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7) to create a department of education, to authorize appropriations for the conduct of said department, to authorize the appropriation of money to encourage the States in the promotion and support of education, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1201), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CARTER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15085) to perpetuate the memory of the Chickasaw and Seminole Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1202), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. VESTAL, from the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, to which was referred the bill (S. 3774) to authorize the coinage of a Roosevelt 2-cent coin, reported the same with-

out amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1204), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 2610) to provide for the disposal of certain waste and drainage water from the Yuma project, Arizona, reported the same with an amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1203), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. EDMONDS, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13762) for the relief of Robert G. Whitfield, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1197), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15537) granting a pension to Amanda Kenney, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. POUL: A bill (H. R. 15761) amendatory of the acts of July 2, 1917 (40 Stats., p. 241), and of April 11, 1918 (40 Stats., p. 518), in relation to condemnation proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin (by request): A bill (H. R. 15762) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, consider, and adjudicate claims of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 15763) for the relief of persons claiming right of allotment on the Bad River Reservation in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (H. R. 15764) for the enrollment and allotment of members of the Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewas, in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15765) promoting civilization and self-support among the Indians of the Mescalero Reservation in New Mexico; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 15766) to amend section 19 of the Criminal Code of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 15767) to authorize the coinage of a 50-cent piece in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of Missouri into the Union; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 15768) making appropriation for the improvement of Quincy (Ill.) Bay; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HUDSPETH: A bill (H. R. 15769) to authorize the construction of a bridge over the Rio Grande River between the cities of Del Rio, Tex., and Las Vacas, Mexico; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 15770) to authorize the more complete endowment of agricultural experiment stations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 15771) to provide for actual and necessary expenses of officers of the Navy when traveling by air; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15772) requesting railroads and transportation companies operating within or without the continental limits of the United States to grant reduced rates to persons in the military services; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 15773) limiting the payments of gratuities for enlistments in the Navy and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15774) governing reenlistment gratuities for men reenlisting in the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. OLIVER: A bill (H. R. 15775) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to check against the accounts of naval reservists for nonperformance of training duty; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LUFKIN: A bill (H. R. 15776) to amend the act for the establishment of marine schools, and for other purposes, approved March 4, 1911; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 15777) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to remove the charge of desertion in certain cases; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COADY: A bill (H. R. 15778) to amend and reenact the first paragraph of subdivision (a) of section 209 of the transportation act, 1920; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LUFKIN: A bill (H. R. 15779) granting allowance to disbursing officers for payment for civilian outfits furnished enlisted men; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 15780) to amend section 1 of the act of Congress approved March 2, 1895 (28 Stat. L., p. 907), and to extend restrictions against alienation of lands allotted to and inherited by certain Quapaw Indians, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 449) to provide a commission to inquire into and submit recommendations to Congress relative to the erection of a suitable memorial to the late Admiral George Dewey, United States Navy; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. MASON: Resolution (H. Res. 646) requesting the President to furnish information in connection with the sending of troops to Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLEARY: A bill (H. R. 15781) for the relief of the Merritt & Chapman Derrick & Wrecking Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DRANE: A bill (H. R. 15782) granting an increase of pension to Luray McClellan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLOOD: A bill (H. R. 15783) granting relief to Everts Walton Opie; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARDY of Texas: A bill (H. R. 15784) authorizing the President to reappoint and honorably discharge David J. Sawyer, second lieutenant National Army, as of May 11, 1919; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HILL: A bill (H. R. 15785) for the relief of James Gilroy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 15786) granting a pension to Harrison Lantz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 15787) granting a pension to Burnham Gibson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RUBEN: A bill (H. R. 15788) granting a pension to Joseph Floyd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VENABLE: A bill (H. R. 15789) to authorize the President to promote J. C. Lewis, a technical sergeant, Quartermaster Corps, to the rank of a first lieutenant, Quartermaster Corps, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 15790) granting an increase of pension to William Teeters; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5023. By Mr. CANNON: Petition of citizens of Kankakee County, Ill., favoring the immediate recognition of the republic of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5024. By Mr. CURRY of California: Petition of Sacramento Federated Trades and Labor Council of the city of Sacramento, Calif., opposing the enactment of the so-called blue laws and Sunday laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5025. By Mr. DALE: Petition of Dr. Theodore Ellis, osteopath, proposing an amendment to the Fess bill; to the Committee on Education.

5026. By Mr. KLECZKA: Petition of Wisconsin State Conference, Near East Relief, requesting relief for stricken Armenians; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5027. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of Loose Wiles Biscuit Co., of Long Island, N. Y., favoring a gross sales tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5028. By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of R. H. Macy & Co. (Inc.), of New York, favoring a daylight-saving law, to be operative within the eastern time zone from the last Sunday in April to the last Sunday in September of each year; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5029. Also, petition of M. J. Whittall, of New York, and J. J. Atkinson, of Hotel Lorraine, New York, favoring a daylight-

saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5030. Also, petition of the Commercial Telegraphers' Union, opposing the passage of House bill 14657; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5031. Also, petition of William Manger, of Manger Hotels, favoring a gross sales tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5032. By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of Ilion (N. Y.) Chamber of Commerce, urging an appropriation for the purpose of erecting a post office at Ilion, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

5033. By Mr. STEPHENS of Ohio: Protest of the Oskamp Nolting Co. against an additional tax of 5 per cent on jewelry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5034. Also, protest of the Richardson Co. and the Philip Carey Manufacturing Co., of Cincinnati, against import duty on wood pulp; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5035. Also, petition of the John Hill Foundry Supply Co., the Isaac Joseph Iron Co., and the Edna Brass Manufacturing Co., favoring the Winslow bill amending sections 204 and 209 of the transportation act of 1920; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, January 18, 1921.

Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we thank Thee for the light of another day and for all the opportunities that it may bring to us of privilege of service in Thy name. Glorify Thyself through our lives, we humbly beseech Thee. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The reading clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MEDILL McCORMICK, a Senator from the State of Illinois, appeared in his seat to-day.

REFUNDS BY BUREAU OF IMMIGRATION.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of Labor submitting estimates of appropriation in the sum of \$410.50 for payment of refunds by the Bureau of Immigration, Department of Labor, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which the concurrence of the Senate was requested:

H. R. 397. An act to authorize a lieu selection by the State of South Dakota for 160 acres on Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8692. An act authorizing the exchange of lands within the Montezuma National Forest in Colorado;

H. R. 11841. An act to amend "An act granting additional quarantine powers and imposing additional duties upon the Marine Hospital Service," approved February 15, 1898;

H. R. 11851. An act authorizing the exchange of lands within the Rainier National Forest, in the State of Washington, and for other purposes;

H. R. 13051. An act to add certain lands to the Lemhi National Forest, Idaho;

H. R. 13225. An act providing for the allotment of lands within the Fort Belknap Indian Reservation, Mont., and for other purposes;

H. R. 14311. An act to authorize the improvement of Red Lake and Red Lake River, in the State of Minnesota, for navigation, drainage, and flood-control purposes; and

H. J. Res. 440. Joint resolution directing the Secretary of War to cease enlisting men in the Regular Army of the United States except in the case of those men who have already served one or more enlistments therein.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 793. An act authorizing the issuance of patent to the Milk River Valley Gun Club;

S. 2379. An act to provide for the disposition of certain public lands withdrawn and improved under the provisions of